

**DUE DATE SLIP****GOVT. COLLEGE, LIBRARY**

KOTA (Raj )

Students can retain library books only for two weeks at the most.

BORROWER'S No.	DUE DTATE	SIGNATURE

## INDIA IN CHAINS

*By the Same Author*

THE GOSPEL OF FREEDOM

THE SECRET OF ASIA

SRI KRISHNA

MY MOTHERLAND

THE SPIRIT AND STRUGGLE OF ISLAM

# INDIA IN CHAINS

BY

Prof T L VASWANI

Re 18

GANESH & CO MADRAS

THE CAMBRIDGE  
PRESS, MADRAS

## CONTENTS

	Page.
Foreword	vii
The Nation's Task	1
India in Chains	3
Breaking the Bonds	8
Temples of Sacrifice	13
Is Democracy Alien to the Indian Ideal? .	21
Democracy in Aryan India .	31
Ghosts and Freedom	38
Do not invoke the Sircar's aid .	43
India's Destiny .	46
Flag of Faith	51
In Search of Herself ..	59
In the Depths ..	64
The Nation and the State .	70
Can Faith Live without Works? ...	84
India's Challenge ...	104
The Heart of the Struggle	117
Missing the Meaning of the Movement ..	121
India's Ultimatum ..	125
To Liberty ..	131
The Duty of Resistance ..	140

## FOREWORD

The Publishers bring together in this volume some of my recent Essays and Addresses to Young Men on the Problem of Indian Freedom. They indicate the standpoint of one who is not a politician but who believes profoundly in the values of national freedom and has earnestly desired to speak and write without hate or anger in his heart. The spectacle of a great Nation held in subjection still has filled me with an emotion far removed from hate or anger. It has made me unspeakably sad. I have felt, again and again, that there are chains on my feet as long as India is in chains. In his recent book on "India,—Old and New" Sir Valentine Chirol says—"Since I was last in India, things seem to have moved during that short period at a more break-neck speed out here than almost anywhere in Europe." Things *have* moved in India, but *not* fast enough! For the fact still stares us in the face:—India is in bondage. The 'Reforms' have not

helped us. Lord Reading spoke of 'justice' and roused in many the hope that in this unhappy country he would inaugurate a reign of law; we see increasing signs of a reign of repression. An English paper made a significant confession the other day. "The plan of giving India self-government," it wrote, "was never anything more than a pretext of an illusion. And if the British people do not want to get out of India, they must continue to rule India. Mr. Montagu's policy has been, so far, a disastrous failure. And it is not going to succeed." I believe Mr. Montagu means well; but he does not realise, no British Statesman realises the character and Call of "India's Destiny." The Reform Scheme has proved a failure. Lord Reading is a man of strong mental calibre. But he is at the head of a machine which resists the personality of the Nation. The State in India is not free; it is dominated by an 'Empire' which is, so far as Indians are concerned, an Armed Organisation of exploitation and racial supremacy. To this State is opposed the Nation—a point briefly indicated in my address on "The Nation and the State." The conflict between the two is inevitable. It can disappear if either the State ceases to be servile or the



Nation ceases to assert its Rights. In the papers on "India's Challenge" and "To Liberty" I have tried to indicate how the Nation is asserting itself in several ways. The Nation will, I believe, continue to assert itself, until by the working of one of the great Laws of Human Life, it attains to *freedom through repression* ! Repression cannot for a long while get the better of Life. Once the State in India ceases to be servile, British imperialism will, I believe, receive a fatal blow. The heart of British imperialism, as I understand it, is *India in-bonds*. A Free India means the death of Britain's Empire Cult. That Cult is at the root of much trouble in India and the East. An Englishman says he asked a Commanding Officer in Ireland if the Sermon on the Mount appeared to him to be a 'seditious document.' "Certainly," was the officer's answer. Patriotism, in India, is penalised as 'sedition' ; for the 'Empire' has made Mammon its God, and patriotism is a challenge to England's exploitation of the East.

Modern Imperialism and exploitation go together. It is easy to understand why England is a party to the partition of Turkey. Lord Robert says the British have "lost reputation

and money in Persia, in Mesopotamia." Viscount Grey speaking of Mesopotamia the other day confessed that "we were under no obligation except to give self-government to the Arabs. Instead, the Government embarked on a policy of military occupation of the country with the result we had lost friendship of the Arabs. An enormous amount of money was spent." Money was spent and Indian army was sent to fight the Arab with a view to exploit Mesopotamia after subjugating the country. We have read much in British books against the "Zappelin bombardments of helpless citizens" by Germany in the World-War. But the *Daily News* of October 6th said:—"The Colonial Office states that a *further* aeroplane was carried out in the Nasiriyet area (in Mesopotamia) on September 30th against the section of the Beni Said tribe which had adopted a defiant attitude." There is, to my mind, no *essential* difference between the imperialisms of modern nations of Europe; and the motive of British *navalism* does not seem to be very different from the motive which actuated German *militarism*. In a beautiful passage in the drama named "Shakuntala" the Indian poet Kalidasa says:—"Let Sovereignty be a servant unto the People."

This cannot be said of modern imperialisms. They are in the East not to *serve* the People but to *dominate* them for economic aggrandisement.

Much has been written in text-books taught in the State-schools of the "blessings of British rule" and of "*Pax Britannica*." I am a man of peace. But in India we have an *armed* peace! Railways and telegraphs are reckoned among the 'blessings' of the British rule. They have helped on the processes of exploitation. Canals and irrigation schemes, not unknown to pre-British India, have, doubtless, increased in our days, but the peasant remains poor. India is the Land of Peasants; and Sir Charles Elliot, an ex-Lt. Governor of India said.—"I do not hesitate to say that half of our agricultural population never knows from year's end to year's end what it is to have their hunger fully satisfied." So Gokhale said:—"Sixty to seventy millions of people in India do not know what it is to have their hunger satisfied even once a year". English education, we are told, is a *blessing* we owe to the British rule. Sir Valentine Chirol says:—"Many nations have conquered remote dependencies inhabited by alien races. We alone have attempted to

educate them in our own literature and science and to make them by education the intellectual partners of the civilization that subdued them." Here, too, there is the other side of the picture. I have not denied the value of Western science and literature, the platform of culture is sacred and knows no limit-lines of creed or color or race. But can it be denied that Western science and literature, *as taught in this country* have developed in the majority of students an attitude of *secularism* which cannot help India? Western culture *as it is taught* in Indian universities moves in an atmosphere of an external, aggressive civilization. And to let such a 'civilization' 'subdue' India would be to miss the meaning of Indian ideals and their world-values.

I do not wish to ignore the gains to our life through our contact with the West. We had slumbered too long; we needed a *shock* to rouse us from the slumber; that shock came to us through the British domination of India. We have gained, also, by a study of Europe's scientific knowledge and political history. A deeper study of these should teach us yet more. But the *motive* of the British domination has not been the *cultural advance* but the *econo-*

*mic exploitation of the People.* Mr. Beaman spoke frankly when he said that the rule of the British administration was—"Might is Right", and that the British "began to flounder" when they began "to introduce moralities and quibbles over the ethics of their status" in India. India was great in history before the British came. India stood at the heights of civilization in the 17th century. British imperialism has proved a steam roller rolling down the life and ideals of the Indian People. India's Destiny calls Her to-day to return to Herself.

In more than one essay included in this volume, I have indicated how India may answer the Call of Her Destiny. I hold strongly that India to be Free need not, should not, appeal to methods of physical force and violence. What is needed is not a *blood-revolution* but a *psychological revolution*. What the People need is not to lift up the sword or resort to guerilla warfare but to *feel* and to *know*—to feel the state of subjection and to know the genius and ideals of India. The mistake of the Indian National Congress for many years lay, I humbly submit, in looking for India's salvation outside India. It has been in existence over 35 years. A generation,

according to my reading of history, is more than enough for raising a People to greatness. India is still struggling for Freedom. The Congress was, for many years, satisfied with 'resolutions' and 'petitions' to the *sircar*. The utmost to its credit is the Reform scheme. But the 'Reforms' are not Swaraj. The 'Reforms' have done us little good. They have made the Administration more costly. They have not helped the country even in such a matter as prohibition of the drink-traffic. They have lent a new 'prestige' to the bureaucracy; they have not helped the People. The word 'swaraj,' it is true, has found its way in a Royal Message; but the word is not the thing. "For years", His Majesty said, "it may be for generations, patriotic and loyal Indians have dreamed of *swaraj* for their Motherland. To-day you have the beginnings of *swaraj* within my Empire and widest scope and ample opportunity for progress to the liberty which my other Dominions enjoy." As a *matter of fact*, as we know, the Reforms Act has *not* meant any change in the *essential* character of the State in India; the State remains bureaucratic. Sir Valentine Chirol admits that under the Reforms Act "the powers of the Government of

India still remain supreme." It may sound paradoxical, but I hold it true that the problem of India's freedom, the problem of *swaraj* belongs to the province of *psychology* more than to the province of *politics*. The bureaucracy has built its power upon certain *illusions*. These illusions must break if India is to be a free State. I call these illusions "ghosts" and refer to some of them in my papers on "Ghosts and Freedom" and "Breaking the Bonds". One of the "ghosts" with which we have been frightened long is —democracy is of the West and is alien to Indian consciousness; we must, therefore, learn democracy of our 'masters' gradually.—"step by step"! This "ghost" I have wished to lay at rest in my papers.—"Is Democracy alien to the Indian Ideal?" and "Democracy in Aryan India." Some more "ghosts", as the reader will see, are referred to in some other essays in this volume. If, indeed, I had to choose a rather abstract title for the book, I would have named this volume:—"Ghosts and Freedom." For the Problem of Indian Freedom is, to my mind, mainly psychological. Let the "ghosts" go and you are Free! A well-known French writer says in a recent book:—"That 60,000 English are able to keep

under the yoke 300,000,000 of Hindus who are their equals in intelligence is due to certain qualities of character." By the "Hindus" he, doubtless, means inhabitants of Hindusthan and they are not Hindus alone; they include Muslims and men of other faiths. The millions of India are dominated by the British bureaucracy. This is due to certain "illusions" to which Indians have long surrendered themselves. Shake off the illusions! I say to my countrymen, and you are Free! It is the ancient message of Sri Krishna:—*Stand up! Parantapa!* There is the story of a man who *wished* to cut down a tree but he did not cut it; years passed by; he went on *wishing*, he did not cut the tree. "I grew old" he said, "looking for the axe." Mere *wishes* never helped a man or a nation. Many political workers have "grown old," "looking for the axe," to cut down the heavy bonds of India. For long years, we wandered begging others to 'give' us "freedom." We did not find the "axe." The "axe" is the *will-to-freedom*. For many years we petitioned; we bargained; we did not show the *will-to-win*. What is called "constitutional agitation" in this country has meant with many the easy method of "petitioning" or



“bargaining” with another nation. Such negotiations must fail. Freedom never came with ‘bargaining’. Freedom must be *won*. India is *awakening* to-day; India, I hope, is showing some *will-to-win*. Once this Awakening spreads to villages; and the Will-to-Win becomes stronger, India will stand erect,—a Free Nation ready to respond to the Creative Ideals of her own genius for self-realisation and the service of the Nations. The Awakening, I speak of involves reliance on *reason* and India’s *genius*, and the Will-to-Win implies readiness to suffer.

The Awakening and the Will-to-Win should be the inspiration of India’s students. I have very briefly referred to this in my address on “Temples of Sacrifice.” That chapter in the volume indicates some aspects of a system of national education, as I conceive of it. I do not want students to reject the gains and gifts of Western life. We must not dishonour the God of the West. And Indian students should assimilate the spirit of science and organisation. There is much, too, I believe, in the *social programmes* of the West which should help us,—in many cases by *warning*, to tackle our social problems. But the *fundamental* note of our

education should be,—appreciation of Indian ideals. Students must learn to respect India's genius ; otherwise they cannot respect their own destiny. They must *know* India and they must have the *will-to-win* freedom. There is, to my mind, no greater impeachment of the current system of education than the fact, the humiliating fact, that in the martial law *regime* in the Punjab when students were asked to carry their luggage on their heads and march five miles under the sun, *not one student refused* and when men were asked to crawl on their bellies, *not one* stood up boldly to say :—“I shall *not* obey this inhuman, crawling order.”

The Education our students need is one which will inspire them with reverence for India. Out of this reverence will grow self-respect and the will-to-suffer for freedom. Therefore have I urged that National Schools should be “Temples of Sacrifice.”

The Indian atmosphere to-day seemed to be charged with thoughts of revolution. I believe in what in one of my essays reserved for another volume I have called “Creative Revolution.” I do *not* believe in a nationalism of physical force or violence. India's problem

of freedom, as I have said, is mainly psychological, India's hope is in a courageous return to Herself in loyalty to her own Creative Genius. Therefore have I asked young men, again and again, to remember that freedom,—India's freedom,—cannot be really built with violent hands of passion and hate. This faith in *ahimsa* appears incredible to many in India and the West. "With Ireland and Amritsar before us," wrote the *New Republic* of America, "we can only marvel at the greatness of such faith." The faith is great. And where in the world may the faith *work* if not in India? Can India really find the Charter of her Freedom by trampling upon her spiritual intuitions? And even if you succeed in setting up *swaraj* by violence, will it be, I ask, a *worthy winning of Freedom*? Will it be worthy of India,—worthy of her ancient Civilization,—worthy of her spiritual genius? There is a beautiful little story told us in a Jewish book. Adam, we read, was sent out of Eden; at the gate stood an angel with a flaming sword. To him Adam said,—“What shall I bring back to God when I return?” And the Angel said:—“Bring Him back the Face He gave You in the Garden and I shall let you in.” What face will

India bring back to Her God at the coming Festival of Freedom? Will it be the Face He gave Her in the long ago,—A Face of immortal glory? Or will it be a Face marred by hate and strife and violence? One thing I believe in profoundly, that the Spirit of Humanity calls for the love of the Nations. And I pray that the Great Ones may so guide India that Her Children may worship Liberty not with violence but with the wisdom of Her sages.

T. L. VASWANI.

# INDIA IN CHAINS

## THE NATION'S TASK

*For centuries the Nation's millions slept ;  
At last they wake, they see, they cry, —  
"Freedom must be saved or Orient's ancient Nations  
die."*

*From cities and hamlets and hoary hermitages,  
From fiery Mussulmans and mild men of the Aryan  
Race,  
Comes Freedom's cry with new devotion to India's  
cause.  
It is the cry of Comrades who forget the feuds of  
yesterday  
And stand together for Faith and Fatherland.*

*This cry is the message of India's long exile ;  
This cry is the speech of her sorrows, her nights of  
pain.  
Not ours only, the cry hath come from the Great God-  
Heart ;*

*I hear it in birds and flowers and trees,  
In the Sindhu immortal and the surge of the Sea ;  
I read it in the Star that gazes with golden eye,  
And sing it at the Master's feet :—*

*"Freedom must be saved or Orient's ancient Nations  
die."*

*Freedom's Flag they bore and lifted high,—  
Socrates and Jesus and St. Joan of Arc,  
And Mahomed the Praised, and Mazzini, Mansur,  
And many more—God's Rebels—in East and West.  
With bleeding hearts they bore it on the world's rough  
road,  
Silent in the midst of lies,  
Calm in the midst of tumult, strong under every strain,  
And worshipping the Beautiful in bitter struggle and  
pain.*

*'Tis the Banner of the Immortals !  
It calls us through the din and the dark of to-day ;  
It calls us to prove our manhood in the strength of the  
Pure and the Meek !  
It calls us to a new consecration,  
To make life an Oblation,  
To seek not Greatness but the Service of the Nation,  
To adore Allah the Merciful midst struggle and strife ;  
So may the Peoples enter into Freedom and Life.*

## INDIA IN CHAINS

An eminent patriot of the West has said :—  
“ Around the flowers of a beautiful earth, they have ~~erected a house of slaves.~~” Was that spoken of India ? A lover of freedom feels in this country that he is in chains. It is easy to speak of India's poverty ; there is a loss greater than the material—a moral loss,—a loss in character, in self-respect and independence inflicted on the people by the bureaucracy. And until there be a *change of heart* in the administration, I cannot understand how we can co-operate with it.

There is no *rat* for Indian in the world ; her self-respect has suffered ; her voice is not heard ; her message is ignored ; she can speak in the Counsels of Civilization only if we *mean* to be *free men*. There is the meaning of non-cooperation. You cannot, as lovers of freedom

and justice and truth, have a part in the present administration.

Repression is the bureaucracy's favourite method and with none so great a favourite as with the British bureaucracy. A number of Khilafat and Congress workers have been sent to jail. There are rumours of yet more arrests. That is how the system 'carries on!' It seeks to overawe people into silence by brandishing the "big stick."

The heart of the people, I feel, is sound; it has blessed this struggle for Freedom.

We can achieve swaraj earlier than many expect it. *But on certain conditions.* Courage and calmness and Hindu-Muslim solidarity and the *will-to-suffer* will give the people a victory.

Feelings are running high at this hour. It is for us to convert these feelings into *practical* work and we must not forget that India's Freedom will not be won without voluntary suffering. Swaraj, I believe, will be won when thousands and tens of thousands of us are ready to enter the prison-house as a Temple of Freedom. We must not complain. We must not have hate for the 'foreigner.' We must not let the purity of the movement be tarnished by counsels



of passion or strife. What we *must* do is to meet power with the moral ideal and with faith in the value of suffering. We will not have to wait long then to make the nation free.

The struggle we are in is of a *moral* character, and to the bureaucracy's *power* we must oppose our *moral strength*. Repression thrives on the people's violence and Government would only be too happy to shut down the whole movement if there be some riots in the country.

I believed profoundly that in non-violence is our victory. Let Government do its worst, we must remain self-controlled. Let us work for the release of innocent political workers not by violence, not by petitions to Government but by working out the programme of non-co-operation with a view to establish a Swaraj Parliament. We can establish the Parliament if we are *united*, if we are *non-violent*, if we make the swadeshi campaign a success and if we develop the will-to-suffer. Some of us, many of us, may perish in the Struggle; but our sufferings will be a witness to the world of our faith in freedom. And when innocent, pure-hearted men and women suffer, God's blessings, I believe, are poured upon the cause in abundance.

The dumb millions of India are speaking to-day with greater vigour, are ready for greater sacrifices than, perhaps, many even of the English-educated community. And the unrest this time is not simply felt by the Hindus; the unrest has penetrated the great Muslim community. What is more significant is that the Muslims are advocating to-day, with as much vigour as the Hindus, the doctrine of non-violence.

What does the situation demand? (1) That there will be more and more arrests in a very short time may safely be assumed. But our answer to all repression must be strict non-violence. We must be non-violent even in our thoughts; otherwise we will not help in the growth of atmosphere which is necessary to the success of the Movement. (2) We must concentrate upon *Swadeshi* programme. Our towns and villages must be clothed in *Swadeshi*. (3) There must be real solidarity among political workers, and the basis of that solidarity must be *moral* not *opportunist*. Our political organisations will not stand the test of the coming days if they do not draw their strength and inspiration from the moral ideal. I believe profoundly in the *law of karma*; and if

in our private lives and public work we trample upon truth and purity, then the only thing we deserve is—defeat and dishonour. The Law is not partial. As we sow, so must we reap

## BREAKING THE BONDS

You remember the sacred story of old. Rama is asked by his father to leave Ayodhya and be in the Forest in exile. He obeys. He goes to take leave of his mother. What does he tell her? "My father has given me the kingdom of the Forest." In that spirit I wish you, students and young men! to help the swaraj-movement. Some of you say to me:—"Our parents resist our wishes and they don't want us to join a national school. What shall we do?" I am old-fashioned enough to ask you to imitate Rama:—obey your parents; serve them; let not the reproach sit upon us that we who talk of non-co-operation are disobedient to the Elders. A student was asked by his elders not to join a national school. He came to me in excitement and said:—"They prevent me; I cannot obey them; I must leave their house; I want to non-co-operate with them"! I said to him:—"My boy, you must not non-co-operate with your parents; go back to your house,

pursuade them , but don't disobey ; go back and serve them." For this non-co-operation, as I understand it, is a Call to Co-operation :—Co-operation of the People for the service of India. It pains me when I hear some speak approvingly of 'social boycott' in the name of non-co-operation. It will be a tragedy if non-co-operation, too, becomes anti-social. Social and national service is what the true *Swarajist* must aim at. And if that service mean trouble, privation, suffering, he must accept them in the faith that they will draw nearer the Day of India's Freedom. "My father has given me the kingdom of the Forest." If your parents prevent you from joining national schools, I ask you to obey them. "But we want to help the *swaraj-movement*", you say. I am glad there are so many among the students of India who have the desire to help the Movement. But you can help on the plane of thought and prayer when your elders prevent you from helping it on the plane of action. Thought is a mighty force. Send out your thought-vibrations that the great gods may bless the Movement, may guide it, may protect it against counsels of hate and strife, may sustain it to Victory. To a believer in the *inner forces* of life, it matters little if

you are compelled to be in the Schools controlled by Government,—*provided* you still send out thoughts of love for the Nation, still breathe out aspirations of nation-service. There is a story of one who goes from the earth to enter heaven. At the heaven-gate stands an angel. He asks her what she wants. She says she wants to enter heaven. What gift have you brought?" he asks. Her gift, she says, is a drop of blood shed by a warrior in a struggle against a foreign invader of his country. The gift, the angel says, is precious; but she must bring a better gift, if the heaven-gate is to be opened. She returns to the earth, then brings to the heaven-gate another gift,—a drop of blood from the wound of a man tended with loving care by his wife. The angel says a yet more precious gift is needed. She returns to the earth and the gift she brings with her the third time is—a *tear* shed by a boy whose heart is lifted up to God in prayer. The heaven-gate is opened to her. That *tear* is the greatest gift! Your *tears*, your thoughts, your aspirations, your prayers, my young friends! will, I am convinced, help greatly the National Movement. Help us with your thoughts and prayers; and do not defy the parents. *Karma* has

placed you in their charge ; you must do your *dharma* to them

May I, in all humility, request parents not to forget *their* dharma to their boys ? May I, in all humility, say to them :—“Your boys wish to help the Movement, will you check the patriotic impulses and emotions of their pure young hearts ? Don't you also want *swaraj* ? And the schools under the control of Government,—do they help in the Swaraj struggle ? There is one beautiful song I heard the boys sing in the *bazar* :—“We shall break India's bonds”. Will these schools permit such a song to be sung on their premises or in class-rooms ? Do they honor Indian leaders like Lok Tilak, Arabindo Ghose, Mahatma Gandhi ? Is their atmosphere national ? I am told in some of the schools the national cry *Bande Mataram* is prohibited. And how is history taught in these schools ? Shivaji is damned as a robber-thief, but Clive is exalted as a ‘hero’. And is the atmosphere religious ? Are your boys taught *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* and *Krishnabhakti* ? Do they know the Gita and the Upanishads ? I asked a student of one of these schools :—“Why do you study here ? He said :—“I shall pass the examination, then get a ‘job’ in the Revenue

Department and earn a lakh of rupees." Earn a lakh of rupees by looting the Revenue Department!

These Schools move in an atmosphere which is alien to Indian culture and Indian ideals. Therefore I plead for national education. Therefore I plead for Swaraj Schools,—schools which will teach students to live and labour and suffer for India. To every one of you, my message to-day is this:—Swaraj, swaraj is what we want. And swaraj is not to come as a gift to us from the British. Swaraj will not come, and a self-respecting people will not have it, as a gift. Swaraj is to be builded by us with the power of our mind and character. To every parent I earnestly appeal in behalf of the National School. To every one I humbly say:—"ask your sons to bear aloft the standard of *swaraj*." Teach them two things:—(1) that they must serve the Ideal, (2) that they must serve the Poor. India fell when the human rights of the poor were trampled upon; India will rise again when the Poor accept us as their comrades in the Great Struggle. More even than the Hindu-Muslim Unity is, to my mind, fellowship with the Poor. In that fellowship, I believe, is the hope of our Future.



## TEMPLES OF SACRIFICE

Ideas and Ideals control a Nation. And the New Movement will be a failure if it is external, formal, touching only the mechanism of Administration. An important test, indeed, of a vital movement is '—Does it influence the *whole* of the Nation's life? The vast majority of *my countrymen* have put trust in 'politics.' But the 'politics' of a potent Swaraj Movement should be connected, also, with social action, with moral reform, with cultural advance. For true freedom is like light and air; it brings health. And when a Nation grows in health, its Life expresses itself not alone in 'politics' but also in art, literature, science, philosophy, socio-economic advance. To express life thus is to grow in the vision of Humanity; for art and culture are given to a Nation not for its own selfish purpose, but for the service of man. Narrow nation-cults flourish only by trampling upon the Ideal. India has for ages worshipped the 'One in all.' That worship must still be

our inspiration in the work of nation-building. And the thought I would impress upon every one in charge of a National School, is:—Awaken in your students the International Mood.

As I have often told you I do not wish India to become an imitation-England. Swaraj, if it is an imitation of a Western State, must quickly die. Nothing artificial has within it the principle of life. The meaning of swaraj, as I understand it, is,—*India must be Herself*. And to be Herself India must not part with her vision of the Ideal, Her vision of Humanity.

In my curriculum, therefore, of a National School, literature and science have an important place. Both are international; Literature will train the emotion of humanity; the scientific attitude or critical thinking will develop the spirit of freedom. Emotion and *reason*—both are needed; reason without emotion is empty; emotion without reason is blind. In addition to this *literary-scientific* side, there is the *physical* side which demands attention. I have found it neglected in several national schools. The physical is the basis of the national as the body is of the soul. Swimming, rowing, wrestling, 'mock-fighting,'

military gymnastics should, in my opinion, be introduced in every National School. I would, also, wish the students to love swadeshi uniforms; I would have them do some social service as members of volunteers' Bands; I would have the teachers call the students for an all-night march,—say once a term,—as they do in Japan. Not boys alone but also the girls should develop love of games. In June last, 500 Chinese girls took part in the Eastern Championship Games, the programme included a mass drill and a march all over the field! I know of several Indian girls who are fond of games, I believe many Indian girls will take kindly to games if physical culture becomes one of the aims of our National Schools. The Greeks owed much to their love of games. They held 13 annual athletic festivals; every Athenian youth was to participate in them; philosophers and poets took part in the contests; and Plato, we read, won prizes at two of the athletic festivals. Love of games will not be without its influence upon our conduct. It would teach us to *behave as sportsmen*, not abuse the official or even be angry with him. We are out to defeat Government; Government is anxious to defeat us. We must play the

game fairly. We must regard repression as Government's response to our challenge of non-co-operation. And we must be ready to go to jail in a sportsman's spirit.

There is the *practical* side of education, too. Hence the value of spinning. I do not object to spinning institutes but I object to converting all national schools into spinning schools. To do that would be to eliminate culture and substitute for it a useful art. I believe in the values of culture. I know of political committees which are little better than centres of intrigue. One thing I have noticed about those who control these committees is that they are men without culture. Yarn is needed; but *brains* and *hearts* are also needed. And it is *men* not *machines* that will build swaraj. Spinning should be introduced into National Schools; not spinning only but also some other useful arts, viz., weaving, carpentry etc. National education is not complete without a *practical technical* side. But the *practical* divorced from *humanistic* culture cannot help the Nation.

Then there is the *moral* side of education. It was a significant remark a Russian political leader made when he said:—"The man who

gains power by appealing to bad motives is the worst enemy of his country." A National School should teach its students that the man who gains power by appealing to the crowd's passions and prejudices is a *demagogue*, not a *patriot*. It should teach the student that *sacrifice*, not *love of power*, will build a Free India

A National School should be a Temple of Sacrifice. Teachers and students are to be there with the aspiration that they may be accepted as an offering at the Mother's Feet. A National School, as I conceive of it, should be a fellowship of teachers and students, a training in that life of *hardness*, that *tapasya* without which I see little hope for my country. We have been 'soft' so long; it is time to be trained in "hardness", to live simple lives, to welcome repression and suffering as a Call from the Mother of Sorrows. "You talk a great deal of Freedom; but where have you found it?" was asked of a French lady in the 18th century. "In the Bastille", was her answer. There is much truth in it. Bastille was the place of danger; and in the School of Danger, of hardships, of *tapasya*, is Freedom developed. I repudiate, as you may know, the cult of Force

as I do the cult of Power. When I ask you to be hard, I do not want that you should trouble others; I ask you to bear troubles yourselves; have the desire and training to bear hardships, and you will greatly help the struggle for Freedom. The heroic age, they say, is over; an age of secularism and utilitarianism has set in; but a new, a nobler, heroic age may come if we of India, worshipping the Ideal in our hearts, stand up with the dignity of manhood and say:—"We are ready to suffer, but we are not ready to give up the Struggle for Freedom; we may die in the Struggle but we shall not give it up; we shall pass it on to our children and our children's children and our sufferings will not be fruitless." India has every thing; India lacks one thing to-day:—*concentrated will*. John Stuart Mill wrote that "a people like the Chinese may be entirely unfitted for the operation of a representative Government because of their lack of the will and the capacity to fulfil their part in such a Government." And China has built up a Republic; India is struggling still for *swaraj*. Once India *wills* I know of no power that can stand in the way.

There, then, are the two things National Education should develop—*will-to-freedom* and

*reverence for Humanity.* The two are inter-related. For there is no true *freedom* without *reverence for man as man*. There is lack of this reverence. Hence the *race-cults* of to-day. A few months ago two negroes were burnt to death by a mob of white Americans; they were suspected of having killed their white landlord and his son; It was afterwards discovered that one of the two negroes was absolutely innocent; the other's guilt was not 'proved' but there was 'considerable doubt' as to it! Sometime later a mob of Americans, 1000 strong dragged out of jail a negro under-trial prisoner and hanged him from a tree, the charge against him was, the murder of a white woman. In 30 years, 1889-1919, the white mobs in America have murdered 3224 'coloured' people in the United States. In many cases large crowds of the 'whites' assemble to "enjoy" the cries of the poor negroes when they are lynched on 'live coal'! Again, read the "White Book" written by the "Egyptian Commission," if you would know what British imperialism did in Egypt, sometime ago. Here is an extract:—"Women were violated before the eyes of their relatives, men were shot dead at the slightest excuse. Persons were buried up to the waist

and then bayoneted and killed. Whole villages were burnt down." Read the story of the Jallianwala Bag, if you will understand the mentality of British imperialism in India. Read the story of 'reprisals' in Ireland if we would know a little of the dark deeds of imperialism in Ireland. Neither America nor England may be regarded as lovers of Freedom as long as such things continue. For freedom is *reverence for man as man*. Freedom is stifled by imperialism, narrow nationalism, by militarism and navalism, everything which places power above Ideal. Freedom and violence, Freedom and Hate, Freedom, and Race-arrogance,—cannot live together. The problem of Freedom is yet to be solved by the world. India can help much. Will she do it? Then must she be loyal to her ancient vision. Therefore I plead that our national Education must develop reverence for Humanity. Establish in the students' minds the international mood, and India will achieve an enduring *Swaraj*.



## IS DEMOCRACY ALIEN TO THE INDIAN IDEAL ?

There is a pregnant saying of Buddha:—  
“When one nation dominates another, both are unhappy. One dreams of its lost glory; the other fears that the subject-nation may rise. So it is that neither is happy.” The words are true of India, for India is a subject-nation; India is dominated by the British bureaucracy. Both feel unhappy to-day. India is awakening a memory of her lost glory. She remembers that she stood on the heights of civilization at a time when the forefathers of Englishmen were uncivilized, running wild in the woods. She feels her subjection, has been feeling it more keenly since the war. Over and over again the British statesman said, echoing President Wilson's view, that the war was for liberty, that the ‘battles of the Empire’ were meant to make the world fit for free men to live in. India finds to-day that the war was

fought to make the world fit—and spacious—for the 'white men' to live in.

Several insular prejudices prevent even thoughtful Englishmen from realising the truth of the Indian national stand point. One of them is:—"Your aspirations are good, but 'democracy' is a form of Government which the West has evolved and is *alien* to the Indian genius. You must wait, you must take time to learn the lessons of Western Government; you must take time to be trained!" I confess there are elements in the present political life of India which are imported from the West; and it does appear to many that the national cry for 'democracy' is a pale imitation of Western politics. In my theory of life, democracy is neither of West, nor East; it is *human*; it grows out of human needs and aspirations. To show that it is not alien to Hindu race-consciousness is the purpose of this paper.

It is not true to say the Hindus spent their strength in metaphysical speculations. The Hindus, I claim, studied not simply the problems of philosophy and religion but also political, economic and social questions, and they developed practical programmes, which should

prove of value to statesmen and reformers of the modern age. For here in India, in the long ago, were tried several social and political experiments. Monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, democracy,—each one of them was tried in ancient India; and the student of political science will find several suggestive things in the ancient books on Hindu polity

It is unhistorical to say the republican type of Government was unknown to India. The Greek historian of India tells us, Alexander found strong republics in the Punjab and Sind. Vincent Smith admits in his "Early History of India" that in ancient India "the Punjab, Eastern Rajputana and Malwa, for the most part, were in possession of tribes or classes living under Republican institutions" We read in the Books of the Republic of Vajjians, and Buddha realised the value of Republics. We read that he taught the Vajjians the 'seven conditions' of 'efficiency', one of them being *unity*, the other *fellowship with the masses*,—the two conditions which are essential, also, to the strength of the New National Movement. *Swaraj*,—the word is ancient; and its central message, self-reliance, self-determination, is also in the Hindu political books. More than

one Hindu political thinker speaks of the "*Cult of Purusha*", the Cult of Manhood, *Paurusha* is the virtue emphasised in the books. Be men; build up your manhood,—is the teaching given, again and again. "On one's own self", we read, "depends progress or extinction." The king must not be an autocrat and Government must co-operate with the People. For "from the People", we read, "come money, army, raw-products, service, transportation" and other things necessary to maintain a government. The "raja", we read, "does not flourish without People". Indeed, a government failing to respond to "popular will" is, in one book, condemned as Government by "robbers or exploiters of the people's wealth"! In *Sukra-niti* we read that the 'ruler' is a *servant* of the people; that sovereignty is for protection, that the king should abide not by "his own opinions" but by the 'decisions' of the People. 'Respect for public opinion' is referred to in the Books, again and again; and one of the rules of good government, according to *Sukra-niti*, is that the ruler should dismiss an official who defies the people's will. The coronation oath which every ruler had to take is significant. It said:—"I shall always revere my country as the Brahma.

And I shall follow *law*, not my own sweet will."

The Raja had a Council of ministers. Ravan was a Rakshasa but even he, we read, had a Council. The *Panchayats* in each village were republican institutions. They were abolished in 1816 by the East India Company! If we can re-organise them in the light of modern knowledge and the ancient ideal we shall have made, I think, a very good beginning in the direction of *swaraj*. For *swaraj*, as I conceive of it, will not be built without the cordial co-operation of these Panchayats which have in the villages a hold still upon the people. I do not want Congress Committees or other political bodies to break the force of the Panchayats; I want the influence of the Panchayats to be strengthened and thrown on the side of the struggle for National Freedom. Panchayats were a great force in the life of India at one time. They had Arbitration or Conciliation Courts to settle disputes and reconcile parties; they raised famine funds on the security of village lands and administered relief to the poor, they had Public Halls for discussion of important matters; they had Temples and Schools, they had various Committees,—Garden-Committees, Land

Survey Committees, Tanks Committees, Roads Committees. In a country like India, irrigation is property; and they understood, as an ancient Book expresses it, that "property of the people is the property of the king." There were Irrigation Committees to see that the land was kept fertile. And the Central Government did not interfere with the village self-government. The king was the people's protector; the village government was in the hands of the people. The village headman, the *mukhti* of the Panchayat, was honoured by officials. The king's magistrates paid visits to the villages from time to time, but did not interfere with the Panchayats. In an ancient inscription it is recorded that the clerk of the Panchayat was "noting down the proceedings while the magistrate was walking about"! The Panchayats survived the rise and fall of kingdoms; they carried on the village administration in spite of wars and revolutions which affected the Central Government. They did not depend even for peace and 'order' entirely upon the *raja*. They had their own watchmen. In some cases men worked as scavengers during the day and as watchmen at night! The policeman or *chowkidar* was the servant

of the Panchayat; to-day, the policeman is a petty tyrant of the village. No 'reform' of the Indian administration can be of real service to the people, until the constable is made responsible to the public. The Panchayats also collected taxes. And there was a system of elections. *Voting is not a feature of civic life borrowed from the West*, 'voting' was the basis of elections to village Assemblies and Committees in ancient India; and we read, that women too, were elected members! We talk of woman suffrage, but the *principle* was recognised in the long ago. Associated life, according to an English critic, is a principle familiar to the West but not to India. He forgets that there were trade guilds in ancient India. There were corporations of weavers and dyers and metal-lurgists and fishermen and leather workers. There were Chambers of Commerce, too, and decisions were taken according to votes.

But, the critic will say, had you not 'caste' in India? And is not 'caste' the very anti-thesis of democracy? There is no such word as 'caste' in the Hindu books; the word is '*varna*.' You have it—the *thing*, if not the 'name'—among the Nations of the West even to-day. The class hostility between labor and capital

in the West is often worse than "caste-consciousness". Mr. Gretton in his book on "The Middle Class" shows that the English Middle Class has been '*exclusive*', has used its money and capital for personal gain, has antagonised, again and again the guilds of labor, and has used its power to evade taxation on wealth. In several pamphlets, indeed, the middle class man in England was called the 'oppressor'—a name used also for "the high-caste Hindu." But this generalization, like several others, is rash; the English 'middle classes', like the 'high caste Hindu', with all their faults have made contributions to national life. And the *śūdra* in ancient India had full claims to citizenship. He was not a 'helot',—or a slave.

Aryan India repudiated 'slavery' which even so great a thinker as Aristotle justified as something natural. The Hindu recognised, as Plato did, that justice was the bond, the "spiritual bond" of the State, but 'justice' was recognised to be inseparable from '*dharma*.' The *rāja* was not the law-giver; the laws came from the *dharma sastra*; the *rāja* was to be simply an administrator of the law. The basis of Western democracies,—not excluding Lenin's



"classless state"—is physical force ; and Europe has wandered from violence to violence. The basis of the State, according to Aryan *niti*, must be *dharma*. And I know not how national conflicts can be avoided until the moral Ideal is placed above the State. Separation of politics from *dharma*,—this, to my mind, has been the sin of the modern West ; and many of us in India repeat the Western view and say.—"Politics is politics, as business is business" Mr. Havel is so deeply impressed with Aryan polity that he doubts whether the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, constituted as it is now on more or less imperial lines is really more efficient as political machinery than was the philosophic scheme of Indo-Aryan polity in which "the common law of the land, formulated by the chosen representatives of the people had a *religious*, as well as a *legal* sanction and represented the highest power of the State." They misread Indian History who say that the democratic ideal was unknown to Aryavarta. We talk, to-day, of *swaraj*. We would do well to study the ancient Hindu polity. It would, I believe, throw light upon some of the pressing problems of to-day. It would help us much in develop-

ing a scheme of *swaraj*. And India cannot be truly great if she becomes a little Europe, an imitation-England. India's *swaraj* must not be an imitation of the political constitution of a Western Country. India's *swaraj* must be builded in the ideals and genius of the Indian people. And not until India becomes herself, her true self, may India be honoured by the Nations. At Budh-Gaya, under the Bo-tree, Buddha obtained Enlightenment ; The old glory is gone, but still stands a temple there and pilgrims come from different parts to light lamps in the Temple, and to worship Him who brought light to the Nations five and twenty centuries ago. And I dream of a Day when to India as to a Temple would come Pilgrims from different parts, and with reverent hands light lamps of worship to the Ideal which India has adored through the ages. An ancient Scripture expresses that Ideal—the Ideal Democratic,—in significant words:—"Recognition of Equality is the Worship of God."

## DEMOCRACY IN ARYAN INDIA

It is only fair, I think, to admit that our nationalism owes not a little to Western influences. Mill, Morley, Spencer, Marx and Lenin have, to the best of my knowledge, influenced many; Gladstone and Bright were at one time favourites of the 'Liberal' school in Indian politics. It is time, however, I think to study Hindu politics. A careful study should help us in developing a swaraj-scheme; I believe Hindu politics has elements in it of value to the modern world.

The official dominates life in India; a petty policeman can be a terror to a whole village. A member of the bureaucracy may draw a small pay but he wields large powers and is not responsible to the public. The Indian nationalist has been battling with the bureaucracy. He has not yet won the fight though he has, to a small extent, succeeded in breaking down that god of the bureaucrat,—*prestige*! It is refreshing to a student of Hindu politics to note that the

India of the past was not dominated by a bureaucracy. Government usually did not interfere with the local administration of the village which was largely controlled by the *Panchayats*. The bureaucracy loves centralisation; it was the *principle of decentralisation* which, we find, was understood and acted upon in ancient India. Officials were regarded as servants of the country; in one passage in *Sukraniti* we read that if a definite number of persons report against an official he should be dismissed by the ruler. An official has no business to remain if he cannot command public confidence. In another passage we read.—“Officials and servants of the Ruler must live outside the villages.” To-day, we find officials and their servants touring the villages and inflicting *rasai* on poor peasants and villagers. India under British rule has suffered much from *officialism*. What a Spanish writer says of Spain in the days of its decline may, I think, be said of India to-day:—“It is a country of Government officials who look down on you from their lofty eminence and never notice you in the street. Every one is your ‘lordship’ or ‘your excellency;’ and the place is full of titles and decorations.” Non-co-opera-

tion is a protest against *officialism*. In ancient India local affairs were managed by the villagers; officialism did not interfere. Local self-government was developed by *Panchayats*, the policy of the Central Government was *one of wise non-interference*. Village affairs were managed by the *Pandhs*, elected elders; and they were helped by the adult population. Some villages, indeed, were managed by the whole adult population! The village land belonged to the villagers; the *raja* was given a share of the produce; the village land was held in common by the villagers; and when famines broke out the Panchayats found it easy to raise loans for the famished by mortgaging village lands. It was recognised that irrigation was the country's wealth and there were village Irrigation Committees to look after the land. The Panchayats had judicial powers and in several cases, their courts served as Conciliation Boards, reconciling the parties. Some of these were Touring Courts visiting villages and deciding cases on the spot. The Panchayats, too, controlled the village police. The *mukhti* was treated most respectfully by even the very high officials of Government. The people regarded the villages as *theirs* not as they often say to-

day when asked why the streets and bazars are not clean;—"Oh! they belong to the *sircar*!" We read in the books how cheerfully the men in villages offered voluntary labor on important occasions. In several cases it was voluntary labor which made public paths and roads. The villager felt the place was *his*, not the *Sircar's*.

The perfected Democracy, according to a class of socialists in Europe, will be a system of guilds of producers and co-operative societies of consumers. We read of Trade Guilds and Co-operative Societies in ancient India. There were guilds of merchants and workers; and recently some guild seals and coins issued by the guilds were discovered in Northern India. these guilds were *functional associations*; they elected their officers and empowered them to punish offenders. It is a question whether this guild-democracy did not work better even than does the Parliament. A single omniscient Parliament cannot represent well the interests and wills of different *functional* groups or associations; as it is, the Parliament consists of elected representatives of a party or parties, *not* of different *functions*. The "dictatorship of the proletariat,"—is Lenin's idea of democracy. What Lenin has actually achieved,

however, is,—as pointed out by Mr. Russel,—“*internal aristocracy and external militarism.*” Ancient India did not believe in militarism. There was the kshatriya-class; it was trained to fit it for its future; but India's warrior-class did not go upon conquests of other nations. Lust of conquest was not India's sin. India's princes were trained in military arts, and there is a martial note in some poems and dramas of Hindu literature; but nowhere, to the best of my knowledge, is militarism extolled. There are passages indeed, in the Puranas which condemn militarism, and we read that the ‘Mother Earth’ is oppressed when the kshatriya dominates the State. Hindu Democracy, in its best days, was dominated by an “internal aristocracy.” But it was an Aristocracy of Rishis, of men of Renunciation whose wealth was wisdom, whose joy was in the Service of the Aryan Race.

The basis of Hindu democracy, as understood by the great Lawgivers of India, was *dharma*. Again and again, we read in the books that the *Sukha* of the People “the Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number” depends upon *dharma*. Above the *raja* was *Dharma*,—Above the *rashtra*, the State *Dharma*. “The State is

Might." say modern imperialists. "The State is Freedom," say modern Nationalists. But what is Freedom? National freedom is national self-realisation and can there be self-realisation without *discipline* of the right kind? Such discipline is *dharma*. Am I wrong then, if I say:—"The State is Dharma?" If this, the essential spirit of Hindu Democracy—were well understood to-day, we would not have the narrow-nation-cults and arrogant, immoral imperialisms of the modern age. India remains a serf-state; why? Africa has been partitioned by different powers of Europe: why? There is economic exploitation by England in India: why? Greed tramples upon *dharma*. "Not even the crimes," wrote Mr. Hyndman, "of which Prussianised Germany had been guilty transcended in infamy the cold economic and social ruin which we ourselves inflicted on the vast Empire of Hindustan." Dharma is the Law of Solidarity, the Moral Law without a guidance whereof nations and races cannot enter into right relations, one with the other, Dharma is the Law of Human Harmony. Democracy, thus, with the Aryan was not a creed of power but a vision of the Law which binds us all into one Brotherhood and calls us of East and West to



the task of building up a Brotherly Civilization. So it is that you do not find in Ancient India that crude nationalism which appeared among Jews and whose voice speaks to us, again and again, even in the sacred scriptures of the Jews. The spirit of India has been not that of exclusive nationalism but of Spiritual Idealism. Our national ideal has been a *spiritual* one of *dharma*. To-day there is poverty in India; there is insanitation, there is lack of organization; but there is hope if we yet will cling to the *dharma*-ideal of democracy, the spiritual ideals of the Nation. I believe we will. I believe the Mother will be justified of Her children to-day. I believe the Nation will throw up more and more of the men who will serve India, —moved by no greed of gain or power but by *love of the Ideal*, by *dharma* I believe only a *swaraj* which is *dharमारaja* will be worthy of India and the great ones She has given to the world age after age. I *believe* and, therefore I am at once a '*revolutionist*,' and an *optimist*. India,—such the faith of my heart,—will be saved by a moral and economic revolution. Such a revolution would mean India's return to Herself.

## GHOSTS AND FREEDOM

Concerning Freedom, an English poet said "a holier name of soul there is none". In India, to-day, we are in a struggle for Freedom; and is there a word nobler to the Indian ear than the name "Swaraj"? We have talked of *swaraj* for many years. *Swaraj* is yet to be. Why? What things stand in our way? Some "Ghosts"! There are friends, I know, who abuse the *Sircar*. I make bold to say:—let it severely alone; what stands in the way is the mentality concerning the *sircar*; it is the *sircar-ghost*! A sham optimism or opportunism pervaded Indian politics for several years. It was thought that *sircar* would grant *swaraj* and that *sircar* should be humoured or humbugged with petitions and paper-resolutions and 'spirited' speeches. It was forgotten that *swaraj* was not a boon to be 'granted' by a *ma bap sircar*. *Swaraj* must be *our achievement*. We must rebuke ourselves for being disappointed in the *sircar*. Beggars must be disappoint-

ed. They can, at best, get *bhaksheesh* and *bhaksheesh* is not *swaraj*! We went to the *sircar*, again and again; we even sent deputations to the 'democracy' at home. We said—"Give us *swaraj*; you are free: give us the freedom you enjoy". What did they say? "You are not we"! These 'Orientals' are not 'fit' they said! They are 'fit' only to serve imperial interests, I suppose! A Christian preacher said God made Great Britain rich in view of the world-war which entailed heavy expenditure every day! Some European friends in India and England believe that God has made England great in view of the resources of the Orient which the white Races must exploit! We trusted the 'Empire' to give us *swaraj*! We forgot that the empire-cult means *domination*, not *freedom*. The 'Empire' has worked for the greatness of a single race; *not* the service of humanity. Yet I know of very good men still haunted by the 'empire-ghost'. India *within* the Empire, they say! Is not a nobler ideal this.—India within the family of free nations:—Independent India in alliance with Great Britain? We thought the Liberals in England, at any rate, would grant us 'freedom'. Our hopes were high when Morley

became the Secretary of State. The 'ghost' of another saving India haunted us! Was not Morley a champion of national rights and national freedom? And it was Morley who rebuked the 'impatient idealists' in India! The "impatient idealists" asked for no more than Dominion Home Rule for India; Morley thought the demand was impossible; if allowed, it would lead to confusion and carnage in India"; and, in that case, "how," he asked "should we bear the smarting stings of our own consciences"? It has taken us long to realise that Freedom will not come as a 'gift' from the Empire. No imperialism is altruistic. As Dr. Rabindra Nath Tagore points out in his book on 'Nationalism', Great Britain is in India by "imposing its mastery for selfish ends by virtue of a scientific organisation". England's interest in India is mainly *economic*; and that interest must cease if we control our own economic life.

The awakening is come:—*we must rely on ourselves*. Not on the Empire, not on this political power in England or that, not on resolutions and petitions to the *sircar*. These are all "ghosts". We must rely on ourselves. "But," I am told, "the *sircar* opposes

you: how can you triumph over its mighty power?" There you have another 'ghost' which stands in the way of our freedom. It is the ghost of 'fear'! We fear force. When this fear goes, India will be free. There is still this fear in villages and small towns. It is the fear of physical might. What will drive it out? Reliance on the Indian ideal. That Ideal says:—"Thou art That! man is of the Eternal." The only thing we can successfully oppose to the policy of repression is this faith in the Spiritual Ideal. The only way repression will do us good is when it draws out the spiritual in us. Repression, I hope, will lead to liberty in this country. Repression, I hope, will kill this 'ghost of fear'. It will be a great day when India will say in the words of the Russian Novelist:—"A new man has arisen in me". In that day, I believe, will She enter the Temple of the Free. Swaraj means self-rule. Which self? Not the *lower* self of ambition and aggressiveness; but the higher self of *discipline* and *sacrifice*. That self must shape our future. Let the 'fear ghost' go. Repression then will fail. "State is might" said Germany; and it crumbled to its fall. Let us say boldly:—We are up to build a State which is

Freedom." Let us believe in ourselves and the Great Law. And this ancient nation steeled by suffering will become invincible.

## DO NOT INVOKE THE SIRCAR'S AID

A text in the Koran says.—“ Know that God goeth between a man and his heart and that before Him ye shall be assembled.” Before whom are ye assembled? Before the *sircar*? Or before God? “ Before Him ye shall be assembled.” And therefore when you meet together, see that you have no thoughts of ill-will or hate against the *Englishman* or your opponents; see that you do not abuse the *sircar* or *sircarwallas*. The message of non-co-operation is a *spiritual* message; abuse and hate are no part of it. Assemble with clean hearts and listen to no counsels of passion or strife.

I ask you, in the second place, to meet together as comrades in a Common Cause. The message of Non-co-operation is a message of Hindu-Muslim Unity. Bear witness to your Unity not in words but in actions. Do not invoke the *sircar's* aid to settle disputes between you; settle them yourselves; organise Arbitration Boards and give them the power to

settle your civil cases. We cannot successfully non-co-operate with the *sircar* as long as we are unwilling to boycott the *sircar's* courts. Sometime ago, a Muslim explained a case affecting him and a Hindu *sethi* and showed a fine spirit by saying that he did not wish the *Sircar* to settle the matter but that he would submit to whatever the arbitration would decide. And all who were present applauded the Muslim's conduct. Once you, my Hindu and Muslim friends! join hands together as comrades in the one service of the Nation, there is no power on earth, no bureaucracy that can prevail against you.

We want to vindicate national self-respect; we want that the wrongs inflicted on Islam and the Punjab be righted; we want *swaraj*. In declaring our wants, in practising non-co-operation, some of us will be damned as seditious. And we must be ready to suffer for the faith in us. The message of non-co-operation is, thus, a message of *kurbani*, of self-sacrifice. Are you ready to suffer for truth and freedom? My friends from Karachi have asked you to surrender your votes. It is a simple thing they ask of you. Non-co-operation asks of you to be ready to give up many more things, to give up



ease and pleasure, to walk the way of Sacrifice. Sind has men who are well-to-do, has men who have the equipment of study and scholarship, but what are wealth and knowledge compared to the *power of sacrifice*? Sind needs, India needs, men and women of sacrifice. How many of you are ready to respond to the Call? How many of you are ready to say —“Mother! take us up and use us in Thy service?” That Service does mean suffering, but, believe me, every suffering for the Cause is a contribution to the life of India; and to serve India is to serve the Eternal Soul of Mankind.

## INDIA'S DESTINY

Lord Reading's conception of India's 'high destiny' is that of a 'partner', 'a complete partner' in 'the British Empire.' It is difficult to understand how a humanist can respond to the appeal of the imperial idea, even if his nation is called to be a 'complete partner in the Empire.' The Empire of Cæsar, the Empire Napoleon set up, every Empire of which history has a record, has proved to be an empire of domination,—empire of a super-nation, a privileged political caste. An 'Empire' is not a Society of Free Nations. And can it be denied that the British Empire, 'our Empire'—is, at best, one of the White Man? It is not an Empire in which Egypt and Ireland and India have yet received their charters of freedom. Egypt is the heir of an ancient civilization; Egypt is still struggling its way through bloodshed; Egypt is not a Free Nation yet. India and Ireland have both ancient ancestries; both have a civilization fundament-

ally æsthetic and spiritual: both claim a culture charged with idealism and mysticism of sympathy with the divine in nature and man. Both have sorrowed and suffered greatly through the centuries. India—the land of Seers and Sages,—Ireland—the Island of Saints and Scholars,—have sent out to the world the cry of National Freedom. That cry still seems as a cry in the wilderness. Yet Lord Reading would have Indians feel no ‘humiliation’ under the ‘British rule!’

‘Just rule’—is the new Viceroys’ promise to the people. But what is just rule? ‘We shall do what we think right,’—is Lord Reading’s answer. How different this from the modern democratic conception of Government:—“We shall do what the People think right”! ‘Just rule’—yes, but an essential *condition* of just rule is *self-rule*. In a beautiful passage in Morley’s “Life of Gladstone” we read that when Gladstone was asked *how to get the rule of the best*, the answer of that great statesman was:—‘*Freedom*.’ National freedom is necessary to secure ‘Just-rule,’ as distinguished from rule by an official caste. There can be no ‘just rule’ without ‘Home Rule; as Lok Tilak said:—“Freedom is my birthright.” The *psychologi-*

*cal distance* between India and England is still so great that it is impossible to secure a 'Just-rule' until *swaraj* is achieved.

Prof. Thomas said on one occasion:—"I don't think that the love of justice on the part of the Occident has been exhibited in connection with any race, at any time, or anywhere!" This is, to my mind, too severe an indictment of the Occident; but one thing may be truly said:—the Occident has not been just in its dealings with the Orient; and in its mad career of exploitation in the East, it has trampled upon the very elements of international morality.

Lord Reading does not say how many years, in his judgment, are needed to secure India's peace even as a 'partner in the Empire.' He speaks of India rising, through the Empire, to the "heights which the imagination of man is yet incapable of comprehending"! But when, O when?—we impatiently ask. To this Lord Reading gives no answer. Apparently, he does not believe the day is near. And I am not surprised. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report made it clear that India must not expect Home Rule at an early date. The Report says;—"In proposing the appointment of a Commission ten years after the new Act takes effect, we wish

to guard against possible misunderstanding. We would not be taken as implying that there can be established by that time complete responsible government in the Provinces. In many of the Provinces, no such consummation can follow in the time named. The reasons that make complete responsibility at present impossible are likely to continue in operation in some degree even after a decade."!! If it takes so long to secure even provincial autonomy, how much longer may it take to have autonomy in the Central Government?

Is Swaraj, then, to remain a dream of a distant future? Now,—if we will discipline ourselves in the School of Sacrifice. In 1834 Sir Thomas Munroe wrote—"if we steadily pursue the proper measures, we shall so far improve the character of our Indian subjects as to enable them to *govern* and *protect* themselves." Sir Thomas Munroe, like other British administrators before and after him, failed to see that India has a culture of her own and a mentality capable of making fresh contributions to the world's life. But can there be a sadder commentary on the British Rule in India than that the idea of self-government for India enunciated in 1834 had to wait for almost a century

before it was embodied in the Announcement of Mr. Montagu? And up to this day, we are 'unable to govern and protect ourselves'! "We will serve daily the Strong Land"—was the wisdom chanted by the Vedic patriots, in the long ago. Do we wish to breathe out that the Ancient Prayer:—"We will serve daily the Strong Land."? The way to make the Land strong is indicated in another text in which we read:—"The might of right, valour, religion, self-dedication, knowledge and sacrifice—these protect the land." These will make India again. These it is for us to develop within us. For I believe the solution of India's problem is within us. Swaraj cannot come to us as a gift from Lord Reading and the Cabinet. Swaraj must be *built by us with the power of sacrifice*. 'Tis true we have not yet succeeded; but is it not also true that the very banners of our defeat are bright with the beauty of freedom—aspiration? And shall we not bring to the Service of the Mother, all we have,—our manhood, our hopes, our defeats, our unconquerable faith in India's Destiny?

## FLAG OF FAITH

A criticism often flung at the Movement of Non-Co-operation is that it is a revolt against Western civilization. It is a criticism in which critics so wide apart as Col. Wedgwood, Mrs. Besant and Mr. Chariar have joined hands together. Col. Wedgwood said that non-co-operation was directed more against Western civilization than against the British rule! Mr. Chariar in his Presidential Address, conspicuous for its intellectual analysis of the Indian situation and its bold examination of the programme of Mahatma Gandhi, rejected important items in that programme on the ground that to accept them would be to return to 'barbarism!' I remember the indictment by an eminent English thinker, Herbert Spencer, of certain aspects of modern civilization as 're-barbarisation of Europe'! And Mahatma Gandhi's Speeches and Writings have several passages which *are* an impeachment of modern civilization. Writing to a friend in 1909, he said :—"It is not the

British people who are ruling India; it is modern civilization." Another passage in the same letter says :—" If you agree with me, then it will be your duty to tell the revolutionaries and every body else that the freedom they want is not to be obtained by killing people or doing violence but by setting themselves right and by becoming and remaining truly Indian." In these significant words you have the very vital part of the Message of Non-violent Non-co-operation. For Non-co-operation, as I have often urged, is India's effort to return to Herself. The *name* is negative, but the *motive* and *method* are profoundly positive; the Message of Non-co-operation is self-reliance, self-purification, self-discipline, self-realisation. This is a point ignored by the critics who say that non-co-operation is a *negative* movement, a movement of 'have-nots,' a movement of 'antis.' Non-co-operation is, to my mind, essentially a positive movement.

It is a negative only in the measure in which *every positive implies a negative*. And it is true the New Movement is a protest against modern civilization. Not everything in modern civilization is, from my point of view, objectionable. I have not wished to be blind to the



*deeper values* of the thought and life of the West. Indeed, my regret has been that many of those who in India are ranged against the Indian National Movement have *not* appreciated those deeper values; else would they be in sympathy with the forces of Freedom in this country. But there are growing forces in the life of the West which are, I believe, a danger to Humanity; and at this time when the East is under a tremendous impact of the West, it is necessary for us to be aware of them and to react on them with the rich powers of Ancient Idealism if, indeed, we are to help India and save the movement of Civilization.

What is wrong with the modern West? *It has trampled upon the vision of the immaterial.* Its science is employed to nourish capitalistic exploitation; its politics *believe in physical violence rather than in moral force*; its nationalisms are *aggressive*, based as they are on the cult of power; its statesmanship is often a practice of *opportunism* and has seldom moved on the moral plane. "Covet not." —is not the commandment which Europe has honoured. The greed of gain has been "the White Man's burden" in the East! For material gain Europe inflicted upon the African

negro the atrocious wrong of the slave-trade. Think, again, of the unfair economic policy, inflicted on this country ; our economic dependence is, in a way, worse even than our political dependence. Europe's cult of power, Europe's imperialisms, Europe's "gospel of the race" are expressions of the one great sin of the modern West,—*materialism*. The democracies of the West have a great passion for Freedom ; but have they glimpsed the greatness of the Kingdom of Souls ? Europe has produced Lenin : an Ascetic is at the helm of Russian affairs ; but has even Lenin the mysticism of a Mahomed the spiritual vision of the great Leaders of the East ? The Land blessed by Washington and Abraham Lincoln has been called the 'home of Democracy,' but how is the negro treated there ? Read the answer in that moving book recently published, "Children of the Slaves," by Stephen Graham. They, the Negroes number "twelve millions out of a total of a hundred millions of all races blending in America." "And where," asks Mr. Stephen Graham, "where do these Children of the Slaves stand to-day ?" They are treated as out-castes of humanity. And how have the other 'subject races' been treated by the European Powers ? Read the story of the hide-

ous atrocities of the French in Congo, read the story of reprisals in Ireland ; read the story of the Jallianwalla Bagh,—a story which, according even to a British paper, “ recalls the episodes of the early German occupation of Belgium and the old Peterlee massacre in England.”

The Peace Treaty,—is it not based on the same cult of Power and Pride—the Cult Materialistic ? An English paper referring to the recent disclosures made by Foch in regard to the Peace-negotiations says —“ The most arresting story he tells us in that Clemenceau tried to *postpone* the commencement of the armistice from 11 in the morning to 4 in the afternoon so that the *booming of the guns* which were to herald the armistice in Paris might *take place while, he, Clemenceau, was addressing the Chamber*. Such are your gods, oh Israel ! This wrinkled old man tried to continue the *world's imprisonment in hell for five hours in order to secure a background for his speech.*” And the Peace Treaty itself,—is it moral or imperialistic in conception ? Has it kept the pledges with Islam and India and the East ? Speaking recently on the subject, Captain Edward Gill said :— “ It has failed in its first pledges. Whichever way you look, you,

find as far as England is concerned, that *we have betrayed every pledge and every promise that we made when we went into the war.* I have learnt one lesson as a result of this War. War does not settle anything. The lesson for us is this, we have failed to win the ideals that we thought could be won by the use of force. We have to turn to other weapons.' Yes; Europe has failed because Europe has worshipped the *cult of power and profit and pride.* This cult is at the root of the wrongs Europe has inflicted on Islam and India and the East. This cult is the very culmination of a materialistic civilization; and non-co-operation is a revolt against it.

And this Revolt *is* a Religion. For over a generation we were groping in the dark, begging at the bureaucracy's doors, beseeching England to grant us what no nation can grant to another, what every nation must achieve for itself—*Swaraj*. After a weary wandering of 30 years and more, the truth has dawned upon us:—A People must work out its own Salvation! *That* is the meaning of the New Movement, as I understand it. It is a Movement of India's—Return to Herself, to Her own, Culture, Her own Civilization, Her loyalty to

the Law of Her own History, Her own Genius, Her own Individuality, the God-given Inspiration of Her own Life. Non-Co-operate,—in order that you may cooperate with the Destiny of your Nation. In God's name wash your hands of the Environment that has stifled your Life, so that you may move in a new atmosphere of Freedom. Many believed, many still believe, that if some Indians got big jobs in the Administration, India would attain to self-government! Such men believe in the *modern cult of Power*, but the heart of India has accepted the Cult of Sacrifice. So it is *they* have their joy in silver and gold and titles and offices; but the *Soul of India* believes in the Doctrine of the Simple Life. That doctrine is in the simple, single word:—Non-Co-operation. There sings in that one word the Soul of India; it says:—Be simple; be self-reliant; know yourselves; and see that you don't put out the sacred fire which the *Rishis* and the *Buddhas* have kept alight in this Holy Land.

Such, to my mind, is the significance of the New Movement. *I believe profoundly that the strength of India is in the heart of the self-reliant.* It is not a Little England we want our India to be; such an India will be

emasculated ; such an India can make no contribution to the common stock of the Race. India must be true to Her own Genius, must be loyal to the law of Her own life if She is to stand out with the Face of Freedom in a Civilization dying in agony. What the Master said of *spiritual* life is equally true of the *national* :—The *Kingdom is within you*. Not the Cult of Power but the Cult of the Simple Life, not imperialism but faith in Divine Humanity, not Materialism but Sacrifice is what the world piteously needs to develop Free Institutions and nourish Civilization. So believe I. Therefore to me the Movement of Non-Co-operation is *not merely political*. Therefore to me its message is essentially cultural, moral, spiritual. Therefore, too, I believe that no coercion can conquer it. For at its head with the Flag of Faith and Freedom is the Mother Ancient, the Mother Immortal.

## IN SEARCH OF HERSELF

Two things there are in Indian politics to-day, which I regard as spiritual,—*the will-to-freedom* and the *will-to-suffer*. To-day Hindus and Muslims are in a Struggle for Freedom. This Will of a united People for Freedom is, to my mind, a spiritual factor in national life. Organised power,—the 'bureaucracy',—is trying to break the will-for-freedom by a campaign of repression. Many young men are meeting repression with the *will-to-suffer*. This, to my mind, is another spiritual factor in the Indian situation.

There have been stages in the development of the Indian Movement. There was the pre-Congress stage. The 'reformed' Samajees were busy breaking down the autocracy of priests and castes. The Congress started with no programme of *radical* reform. The Congress even expressed 'gratitude' for 'blessings of the British rule.' Gokhale and Pherozesha Mehta were anxious, as Surendranath Banerji is to-day, to

get for the country as many 'concessions' as possible by 'compromise' and 'constitutional agitation.' The 'concessions' are called 'reforms.' Lok Tilak preached the ideal of swaraj. Dadabhai Naoroji boldly proclaimed it at the Calcutta Congress. The ideal was voiced, too, with great vigor by the Bengal School led by Arabinda Ghose, Swami Brahama Bandhav Upadhyay and Bipin Chandra Pal. Then came the Home Rule agitation led by Mrs. Besant. Now we have the Politics of Non-Co-operation and Passive Resistance,—the Politics of Direct Action. The one thing common to all these stages in the programme of National Politics is the *will-to-freedom*.

But the bureaucracy give you 'peace and order' you say! 'Peace and order!' Is India at peace with herself to-day? There is something without which 'peace' brings emasculation and 'order' creates anarchy in the moral life of a people. Peace and order." But, as Sir Thomas Munroe said, a century ago:—"These advantages are dearly bought. They are purchased by the sacrifice of independence of national character and self-respect." 'The benefits of the British rule,'—you say. The question is:—what is their net result? India, as



the National Struggle has shown, has really desired something nobler,—something of a different *quality*, than ‘benefits’ or ‘boons.’ India has been struggling to find her Soul. The economic policy of the British rule has sent India’s soul to exile,—has resulted in poverty of the masses, in general unhappiness. It was a great truth the Hindu sages saw,—the truth of *karma*. You reap what you sow. The ‘dumb millions’ of India are speaking, to-day,—are supporting the Movement! The bureaucracy feel uncomfortable to-day! What sowed unrest? The bureaucratic system. There is the seed of unrest in that cult of power, that ‘civilization’ of ‘comforts,’ that imperialism which the bureaucracy have imposed upon India.

We reap what we sow. And what *karma* did *we* commit to fall so low in the scale of Nations? I have read, again and again, the History of India for an answer to this question. Two things, it seems to me, dragged us down the heights. There was the Hindu-Muslim conflict. Worse even than that was the treatment given to the so-called ‘lower orders’ It was a denial of India’s original vision, the vision of the God-in-Man. Arrested life,—that has been the trouble of India. And the inward-

ness of the National Movement, as I understand it, is India's effort to throw off the influences which arrest her life. India is in search of Herself.

Two things, it seems to me, are necessary if India is to achieve her quest. One is that we must be loyal to India's supreme vision of *ahimsa*. Of him who became the Buddha, it is recorded that in an earlier incarnation He gave His body to feed a starving tigress! To many the *ahimsa* I speak of is foolishness as to the Greek the Cross was foolishness. But in *ahimsa* in non-violence, lies, I believe, the salvation of India. In the spirit of *ahimsa*, with no hate to the 'stranger,' with good-will towards all, must we build *swaraj*. The 'stranger,' too, has his place in the Indian Nation; he ceases to be a 'stranger' the moment he joins hands with us in service of Freedom. He will not, for some time to come; he will oppose to the *swaraj* movement his imperialism, his cult of power, his policy of repression and coercion. We must meet it all with the *will-to-suffer*. Harm no one and accept manfully all sufferings for your faith in Freedom. These two—*ahimsa* and *tapasya*,—are, to my mind, the virtues we need to achieve our salvation. The wheat

ripens under heat; and *ahimsa* in our heart, the Nation will ripen under repression. What lives is the power of Sacrifice.

Two politicians stood talking together and saw large crowds of men moving on to the shrine of a saint, uttering with deep reverence the saint's name, again and again. And said one politician to the other, — "What is *our* greatness compared to his?" The saint's greatness is built in sacrifice, it endures. Do we want to spiritualise politics? We must bring into politics the power of *tapasya*. Do we want to build *swaraj* for the service of Humanity? We must build it with the power of *tapasya*. In an ancient Hindu book, the Nation is compared to a Tree, and you must water the Tree if you would have it grow and give fruit. I ask you, friends! to water India with your prayers and Sacrifice. And India would grow and give to millions the Fruitage of Freedom.

## IN THE DEPTHS

Friends —What is it you want ? Your hearts hunger for three things. There is hunger in Hindusthan; Indian bodies need more food. There is hunger, also, in Indian hearts. That hunger is threefold. You want three things—*self-respect, justice and freedom*. The old mendicant politics are dead. You record your protest against the Hunter Majority Report and the Dyer Debate because they give certificates to an Administration and individuals that have trampled upon the *self-respect of a nation*. Worse than the massacre at Jallianwalla were the indignities and humiliations inflicted on men and women by such things as the crawling order, etc. It is the divine dignity of manhood which the Administration has insulted ; and you are here to say that you will not surrender the Nation's self-respect under any circumstances. Self-respect you want ; you also want justice. There are friends who think that what India

needs to-day is *sympathy* between the rulers and the ruled. I cannot think you are out to beg sympathy of the bureaucracy, you ask for *justice*; India demands *justice*, India says to the civilized world.—I want no favour, no *bakhsheesh* from the British; simple justice is what I claim; and the Punjab tragedy is a violation of the *fundamental rights of man as man*. The Parliament has denied justice to India; dismissing General Dyer with a pension was meant only to save appearances before civilization, and the entire case for justice was given away when Mr. Montagu's Despatch awarded certificates of merit to Sir. Michael and Lord Chelmsford! The British and Indian governments have subordinated *justice* to racial prestige. The offending officials have escaped justice; and the Dyer Debate in the Lords shows what would have been the result even of an impeachment of Sir Michael and his comrades; an impeachment in a House which is a refuge of conservatism and capitalism would have meant acquittal. That Indians have rights which none has the right to violate, that above the Empire or State is Humanity,—that is a truth which the present Administration has ruthlessly trampled upon. And racial

*prestige* is allowed to get the better of *justice to man as man*.

The root of the trouble is:—India is not free. You want freedom ; you want the administration to be under popular control ; you want officials to be servants of the People, not the People to be servants of the bureaucracy. There is, I know, a longing for freedom in your hearts. Then proclaim it to the world ; don't speak of it in whispers ; say boldly to the world:—India asks for freedom as her birth-right, as a right of the Humanity immanent in the Nation. We are out for Freedom ; and we shall have no unclean things in our hearts ; we shall be in this struggle for freedom as servants of the Ideal ; and we shall listen to no counsels of hate or passion or strife.

You are here not simply to condemn the Majority Report and the Dyer Debate ; you are here also to express sympathy with the movement of non-co-operation and to protest against Mr. Montagu's structures on it in the Commons. The movement of non-co-operation is a movement of non-violence ; it is inspired by noble ideal ; it is a struggle for right and justice ; and it eschews all counsels of hate or strife. Yet Mr. Montagu calls it a

mischievous movement! And Lord Sinha calls it a 'pernicious movement.' Why this assault on a moral movement, a movement of peaceful non-co-operation? the movement is penetrating in to the masses; the movement affects the *prestige* of the bureaucracy; and as a bureaucrat confessed the other day, prestige must be maintained at all costs! Therefore must Mr Gandhi's Movement be crushed! And Mr. Montagu says he will not interfere with the measures the Government of India may adopt to combat the Movement! The Government of India believes in *strong measures*; already in Sind the bureaucracy has launched a policy of repression. And repression is bound to be more and more rigorous Will you let it stifle the Movement of Non-co-operation? It is for you to answer If you believe that the Movement of Non-co-operation is meant to help India, then I ask you, my Hindu friends! not to leave the Muslims to their fate, but stand by them in their struggle for justice For 30 years and more you have asked for Hindu-Muslim Unity! to-day the Muslims come and tell you—"here are we: we need your sympathy and support; the cause is yours no less than ours; it is a cause of Asiatic Civilization; it is a struggle

against the aggressive and economic imperialisms of the West ; we Muslims are here, ready-anxious to give you the hand of fraternal fellowship ; 'tis for you to achieve the Hindu, Muslim Unity." An hour of supreme responsibility, this, an hour of great opportunity, in our history. Therefore I ask you, my Hindu brethren, to have friendship with the Muslims in their hour of need ; therefore, I ask you, to support with your strength the Movement of Non-co-operation. Say to the Muslims :—" We, Hindus, are your comrades in a Common Service of the Nation." They have resolved upon a policy of Non-co-operation ; will you co-operate with *them* or will you co-operate with the *bureaucracy* ? It is for you to answer. One thing let me tell you in clear terms. If you will join the Movement of Non-co-operation, be ready to suffer. Repression, as I said already, has begun in Sind ; repression, as I said, will be more and more rigorous ; will you resolve to meet the challenge of repression with courage and faith in the power of Sacrifice ? Not easy to make such a Resolve ; but once made, it will revolutionise your lives ; it will make you *men*. And, believe me, your sufferings will make India rich and strong. There is a russian play written



by the gifted author, Maxim Gorky." One of the scenes is very touching, a woman is dying; her husband is by her; on her death-bed she says.—"Insults have I known all my poor life. Why is it?" And in the depths of his heart he hears a Russian song which says.—"The sun arises and he sets; but prison-walls yet are there." Some such feeling, I know, grows upon many of India's young men to-day. This sad state of India—why is it? They ask. "The sun arises and he sets, but prison-walls yet are there." Chains are on our feet as long as the Muslim trouble is there; prison walls are around us as long as injustice to the Punjab and the Khilafat is not removed. The chains will fall, the prison-walls will break, justice will be vindicated, when you and I and others are ready to suffer,—ready to oppose to the policy of repression our self-control and courage and faith, our reverence for Humanity, our loyalty to the Indian Ideal. Great is the power of silent suffering; great is the power of self-sacrifice. Comrades! get that power from Within, and no repression will prevail against you.

## THE NATION AND THE STATE

A National Drama was staged the other day by some young men of Sind. It brought vividly to the mass mind the picture of the present sad condition. One scene depicted the deplorable State of the villagers under the bureaucracy. Yet another represented how an Indian was called up to court and after a mock-trial sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment for the sin of loving his country. In the following scene, the same Indian Patriot was found in jail praying with folded hands to the Mother! It was a scene which moved many of those who witnessed it. The Mother Bharat-Mata, then appeared to him, the patriot-prisoner and blessed him! A happy idea this,—the vision of the Mother in jail! Once this idea grows upon the people the prison will be robbed of its horrors and would be welcomed as a gateway to a richer life. Some time ago I spoke of the value of the Drama for spreading the national Message. The young men of Sind have shown

what a help a National Drama can become to the people; I would have young men in other places who would serve the Nation to-day emulate the good example of the young nationalists of Sind. In villages, specially, national dramas would prove to be of great interest and appeal; and Sind women would respond with enthusiasm to the National Message if presented to them through the medium of a drama.

The struggle of to-day is a struggle between the Nation and the State. By the Nation, is meant the people; by the State the *sircar*. The sin of the State is its *pride of power*; the sin of the people is their *fear*. Both the State and the Nation need to *purify* themselves; and the purpose of Non-Co-operation is to purify ourselves to rely on ourselves for our salvation and, if possible, to change the *heart* of Government. To sustain the People's struggle to a successful issue, young men are needed and students are needed. The history of Nations of Greece and Italy and Korea, shows how much young men and students have done to help the Struggle for Freedom. If half the number of students left the *sircari* schools and colleges, Government would be greatly im-

pressed; it is not a barbarous Government we are dealing with; Government understands the realities of the situation; and if lakhs of young men leaving their schools and colleges, go to the villages to spread the national gospel, Government would in its own interests seek peace with the People. To young men who would be *sipahis of swaraj* I appeal to speak the *truth* but speak it in *love* and to practise *tapasya*. Many talk of *swarajya* in a few months; it is easy to talk thus; are we showing the sacrifice demanded of us? And can they hope to achieve *swaraj* without sacrifice? Thousands attend the nationalist meetings; thousands and thousands indulge in *jayadhwani's* shouts of 'jai' to 'Bharat Mata' and India's political leaders; but how many of us are ready to worship the Mother with sacrifice? On an answer to this question depends the future. For without sacrifice no nation did ever achieve its greatness.

An ex-Viceroy said the people in behaving as non-co-operators were 'like children' 'refusing to play.' To say this is to forget what the essence of the Non-Co-operation Struggle is:—Play the Man. The people in refusing their co-operation to Government are doing the only

thing open to self-respecting men with sensitive patriotism in a country situated as India is to-day. The people are not out to do violence; they are not out to commit bloodshed, they only decline to stretch hands of fellowship to government *until* certain conditions, are fulfilled; they ask that Dyerism be repudiated; they ask that justice be done to Islam; they ask that India's claim to *swaraj* be recognised; they urge that, until these demands are accepted, they cannot co-operate with government. Is there anything unreasonable in these demands? Yet Government "claims" from "Indians" "help in combating" non-co-operation! "Among Imperialists in England," writes an English paper, "the demand is made for the imprisonment of Gandhi!" A policy of repression, indeed, has already been launched, and some of the Non-co-operators, in different provinces, have already been clapped into jail. That is the way the bureaucracy in India has always behaved; but one is amused at the way the bureaucracy 'claims' from 'Indians' 'help' in 'combating' their own countrymen whose only sin is that they ask Indians to stand aloof from the Administration until certain conditions are fulfilled.

"It behoves us, British and Indians," Lord Chelmsford said, "to counter non-co-operation by propaganda." You are welcome to have an anti-non-co-operation propaganda; but you can crush the new movement neither by propaganda nor by repression. Both propaganda and repression have been at work,—with what result? Government is still calling upon "British and Indians" to "help in combating the agitation"!

"No one could have done more than I," said His Excellency "to bring Muslim view and the sentiments of the Muslim community to the attention of the Peace Conferences which have been considering the Turkish Peace Terms." When did verbal assurances convince a country? Has Government urged that the Premier must fulfil his pledges to Indian Muslims in the War? Has it urged that India stands by the Muslims in their demand? Has it urged that no Viceroy could be held responsible for the consequences which must arise out of a denial of justice to the claims of Islam? Has it urged that if the Cabinet would still trample upon Muslim claims, Indian soldiers would no longer be in Mesopotamia to keep the country for the British? No verbal assurances can convince

the Muslims that the Government of India has done its duty by them in a matter which has profoundly stirred them. As for the attitude of the British Cabinet, M. Briand stated the other day that Britain had given France to understand that she (Britain) 'does not intend to revise the Turkish Treaty

*Lord Chelmsford apprehends that the policy against non-co-operation may fail* "A moment may come" he said, "when our policy fails." The double policy of propaganda and repression, as I have already said, is bound to fail. Then—what then? Then Government expects the 'Reformed' Councils to make only one response to the Government—"We will support you in any action that you may consider necessary to maintain order in the country"! 'Any action' to suppress non-co-operation under the excuse that non-co-operation is subversive of 'order'! The New Movement, it is true, is a big blow at the prestige of the bureaucracy; but it does not aim in having an ally of forces of disorder? Our non-co-operation *is non-violence*; it is pledged to peace and order. Not by violence but by soul-force it means to make the Nation great and free. The way out of the present situation is

not to adopt 'any action' to persecute the new spirit of nationality, but to come to terms with it, to respond to its demand and to rejoice in seeing India become a Nation of the Free.

Mahatma Gandhi wishes the country to 'devote itself to the abolition of drink and untouchability'! The *Times of India* is not sorry for the 'change'; it even expresses 'gratitude to Mr. Gandhi for his change of programme'; but it points out that the 'new form' has 'nothing to do with non-co-operation'! It would not write thus if it took pains to understand the character of the new movement. It is a movement essentially, of self-reliance; *Swaraj* will be achieved not by petitions to sircar but by self-help, self-purification self-organisation; and it is therefore; anything but true to say that 'measures of social reform' have 'nothing to do with non-co-operation.' Measures of social reform by purifying and strengthening the people will enable them to achieve swaraj. These measures are principally three; and each one of them will help in the struggle for National Freedom. The campaign against the drink-evil indicates that the new movement is one of self-purification. Unfortunately, the official class is growing nervous over the temperance campaign! It affects Govern-



ment revenues! But the campaign is proceeding and will not be crushed. Even ladies are picketting liquor shops. It will be a happy day when the habit of taking intoxicating drinks disappears from this land where Teachers have appeared again and again to bear witness to the simple Life!

Another measure of social reform is:—*abolition of untouchability*. And it has a political significance too, it is vitally related to non-co operation, non-co operation means co-operation of the people among themselves, it means the Nation's solidarity, it means not simply Hindu-Muslim unity but also unity of the Hindus among themselves. And this unity, this solidarity must suffer as long as several millions of Indians are regarded by fellow-Indians as 'untouchable.'

A third measure is:—introduction of spinning wheels. This if put into practice will help us on the road to 'economic independence'. And economic self-dependence is involved in a movement of self-reliance. Swaraj is self-dependence. If we realise Swaraj in thought and education and justice and economic life, we will not long wait to achieve it *politically*.

It is not correct, therefore, to say as the *Times*

of *India* does that activities in the direction of these three measures mean that 'non-co-operation is to be suspended if not actually abandoned. The 3 measures indicate the further progress of the principle underlying non-co-operation—the principle of self-reliance. It is surprising to find the *Times of India* arguing that 'non-co-operation' is discarded for the moment, non-co-operation is *neither* dead, nor discarded; its 'measures of social reform' are meant to promote *social efficiency* and *social solidarity*—things essential to the achievement of *swaraj*.

The question of 'social boycott' has agitated the minds of several Non-Co-operators. There are some who stoutly maintain that social boycott of co-operators is 'a right and power' which must be exercised to make Non-Co-operation a success. Is success, we ask, the ultimate end? Is not loyalty to the Ideal nobler than success? There are some who defend the cry of 'shame, shame' upon the co-operators! Once these gentleman received cheers and applause: why should they resent the crowd's expression of disapproval now that they oppose the national movement? So argue some in our midst. The argument ignores the fact that

as we claim our movement to be of a moral and religious character, our conduct as Non-Co-operators must be judged by an ethical, not by a conventional-political standard. And to cry 'shame,' 'shame' upon our Indian brethren for not joining us in the new movement is hardly the way either to express our ideal or to convince others of the faith in us.

But, we are told, such men are only 'a few self-seeking men here and there.' If they are a few, is not that all the greater reason why the majority should be generous in their attitude to the minority? And why do you assume that they are 'self-seeking?' Some of them, at any rate, appear to us to be as honest and as desirous of doing good to the country as several of those who call themselves 'non-co-operators.' But they "injure our interests and impede our advance," you say by not obeying the mandate of the National Congress. Is the decision of the Congress a mandate? What if the decision had been against non-co-operation? The Congress decision should carry weight; but it cannot, it must not shut the mouths of a minority who honestly hold a different view. There can be no progress towards freedom, if decisions of the majority be

obligatory upon convocative objectors. Freedom demands recognition of the rights of minorities. Social boycott contradicts the demands of Freedom.

But social boycott, we are told, is justified by its results! A thoughtful correspondent to a contemporary justifies, strange enough, the regrettable incident connected with the funeral of the Khan Bahadur of Delhi. "The effect or the incident," the correspondent says, "was that a good list of Rai Sahibs contemplate the renunciation of their disgraceful titles out of respect for the public demand." I can understand that several Rai Sahibs contemplate the renunciation of their titles out of *fear* of public opinion; it is difficult to believe that the funeral incident inspired them with *respect* for the public demand; and society is not made better by renunciations due to fear!

But is it not inconsistent, we are asked, to non-co-operate with Government and yet hesitate to declare social boycott against those of the Indians who stand in the way of national progress? The question is natural; the answer is simple. We non-co-operate with Government, but not with Englishmen or Europeans; we non-co-operate with a system, a policy, an ad-

ministration, but we have no quarrel with an *individual*, whether he be an Indian or an European. Much as we love the cause of Non-Co-operation, we love Freedom more; social boycott, I believe, is incompatible with Freedom; and while it may secure cheap success for sometime, its result, in the long run can only be—the collapse of Non-Co-operation. Not social boycott but discipline and the power to suffer for the Ideal will strengthen the New Movement and vindicate the faith in us.

Some time ago a respectable gentleman dropped me a letter complaining of certain things which he attributed to some non-co-operators in his town. From some other towns in Sind, also, complaints have come to me, from time to time, in regard to the conduct of some non-co-operators. I am anxious that non-co-operation should grow from more to more! I am yet more anxious to guard the *purity* of the movement in this Province. For, non-co-operation is a means not an end; the end is self-realisation, self-government. What realisation, what government can we expect to secure if the *self* deteriorates? What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul? I am told that some non-co-operators stood at

the windows and gates of a school and disturbed the class-work by shouting out to the boys to come out because the School was a government aided one. Do we expect to advance the National Cause by behaving thus? I am told, some little boys were asked by a non-co-operator to disobey their parents. Do we expect to help the Nation by breaking up homes? I am told some defaced a wall with abusive epithets against Englishmen. Do we hope to love India by hating the British? I am told, abuses have been showered upon some of those who will not confess the creed of non-co-operation? Do we expect to win over to our side the people now standing aloof from us, by abusing them or showing contempt to them? The Soul of the New Movement is Truth and Love. Not every one who *calls* himself a non-co-operator but every one who strives to secure the Truth as he understands it in the spirit of Love, is a true servant of the Nation. Every national movement throws up for some time men who exploit the people's money and enthusiasm for selfish purposes. Against this evil, the New Movement must guard itself in Sind. Men of clear thinking and moral earnestness and pure heart are needed in every town to lead the new

national impulses of shop-keepers, labourers and students into the right channels. A serious responsibility lies to-day on all those who would serve the National Cause. They must believe profoundly in the Moral Values of life, and they must not speak with contempt of those who helped public life in the past but who, for one reason or another, are not identified with us in the struggle of non co-operation. In his famous book bearing upon Democracy, Toqueville regretted that one of the tendencies of democracy was *ingratitude*. The crowds have short memories; they are often carried away by the impulse of the moment, and it is easy for an 'exploiter' to play upon its feelings. The Movement of non-co-operation in Sind will be justified in the measure it refuses to be influenced by demagogues and is a witness to Moral Values in political life. It will not then be accused of ingratitude to political workers of earlier days; it will respect every public man in the Province who has honest differences with us, but is busy doing good and serving the Truth according to his lights; it will help the forces of freedom. And it is the atmosphere of *Freedom* we want, not this *creed* or that.

## CAN FAITH LIVE WITHOUT WORKS?

We hear much to day of the importance of co-operation, of sympathy and understanding between Indians and the British. But sympathy expressed in words and violated in action cannot secure a happy settlement between two parties. At the very moment there is the talk of 'sympathy,' the Indian Government has launched a campaign of repression against the National Movement. Lord Reading asks Indians "at the outset to give faith to him." But *faith* cannot live without *works*. He says he is "animated with the best motives"; but is he responding to the Indian demands?

These demands are three, and are the basis of the new movement of non-co-operation. India wants justice to the Punjab, justice to Islam, justice to the People. I do not forget the Duke of Connaught's appeal to 'forget and forgive.' To 'forget' would be a psychological impossibility; to 'forgive' would be a moral mockery



unless the party that forgives has also the *power* to punish. Forgiveness is a virtue of the *strong*, not the *weak*, and a Nation is not strong without swaraj. India asks for swaraj not as a 'compensation' for war-services but as her *right*. That right has been denied her long; that right rings in her cry of non-co-operation. The new movement is not a "wave of bad temper—nothing else," as an English correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* wrote; non-co-operation is a moral declaration of India's claim to national freedom. "Never" an Englishman confessed, "never within living memory has the general political situation in India been more disturbed", and Sir Surendranath Banerji only showed how much out of touch he was with the new situation when he said, the other day:—"I am sure the old spirit of co-operation has not died out. It still glows in our hearts. I ask you to rekindle it into a glorious flame"! No. The country's confidence is in the Congress, and the Congress has given its verdict in favour of non-co-operation. *Renewed co-operation, for which Lord Reading* pleads, is not probable until the 3 fundamental demands of the Nation are satisfied. When *will* they be satisfied? The future is in the lap

of the Gods. At present the Indian problem is only being intensified by the thoughtless policy of repression; at present the Government is going steadily down the wrong road.

In 1858 India's destinies passed from the hands of a Company controlled by commercial motives into those of the Secretary of State; in 1892 some small concessions were given to the people to make the Legislative Councils *look* representative; in 1909 a Liberal statesman of England made an effort to offer a few concessions to national aspirations; Mr. Montagu has announced a few more concessions. But the administration of the country has continued to be bureaucratic; it is not representative, not popular. Events have happened, again and again, to dishearten hopes; and the bureaucracy has given no proof of being able to appreciate the standpoint and sentiments of the people. The Dyer Debate in the Lords and the attitude to the Khilafat Deputation supply a commentary on the regard the Empire's representatives have for justice and the interests, sentiments and aspirations of the Indian people. Is it possible to co-operate with the present Administration responsible, among other things, for the Punjab tragedy?

That no Government can govern without minimum *consent* of the governed, is a truth of history easily understood and appreciated in Europe. But Europe is not Asia,—is the convenient plea of reactionary critics of our national movement. The 'Daily Telegraph' wrote that *British rule in India must rest upon 'force and force alone'* India, we are told, cannot be governed on the principle of democracy—as though democracy was alien to Indian consciousness! "India and Indians," says Sir George Younghusband, "are perfectly easily governed by those who know how to deal with Asiatics." Sir Michael O'Dwyer and Genl. Dyer, we are to understand, knew 'how to deal with Asiatics'! Didn't they bring "these Orientals" to their senses by showing them that there was the iron fist behind the velvet glove of the Empire? Did not Genl. Dyer fire on the unarmed crowd to teach the Indians a lesson? Did not Sir Michael create new courts—the lawless Martial Law Courts—to show how 'British justice' could make short work of the 'leaders' of the people? And did not the martial law Commissioners order Hindu and Muslim leaders to be taken in processions—in *chains*—to give the people an object—lesson in Hindu-

Muslim Unity? "No man however great and wise a ruler," says Sir George Younghusband, "can govern India or even a province of it if he is liable to interference from visionaries and busy-bodies"! So according to this critic the few English politicians who in the Parliament and in press ask for a civilized administration in India are visionaries and busy-bodies!

Sir George Younghusband would have the English public believe that dangers attend the admission of Indians as officers in the Army. It was a significant truth the great Japanese,—Count Okura,—uttered when after the Russo-Japanese war he said—"We have destroyed the hypnotism of Colour." It is a truth which has not yet dawned upon the apostles of race-imperialism. Who that knows of the valour shown by Indian armies in France and Mesopotamia can honestly say that Indians should be shut out of the higher ranks of the Army?

"The greatest of all perils," according to Sir George Younghusband, "is the disinclination of the best Englishmen to embark on an Indian career of any sort, be it the Civil service, Army, Railways, Canal or Business." I thought it is too late in the day to ask people to believe that India was meant to be a happy hunting ground

for 'God's Englishman.' India has her destiny to fulfil; Englishmen unwilling to serve in this country are welcome to work where they will; the children of the soil will have their chance, and there will be less obstacles in the way of Indians achieving *swarajya*.

Sir George Younghusband thinks the Viceroy's authority is undermined by political agitation in England. He complains 'that Indian agitators' 'are not discouraged from coming to England to make complaints or influence public opinion against him' He adds—"No man can govern an Eastern country if his authority is thus allowed to be weakened!" He regrets that the Viceroys have not been 'free to govern!' "Not 'free to govern'" Yet India has been overwhelmed with repressive measures. The Press Act, the Seditious Meetings Act, the Rowlatt Act, the Martial Law! Deportations without trial, house-searches, spies, repression of free speech, persecution of men for holding or expressing views on the Khilafat and other matters which the officials dislike, imprisonment of men whose one sin was their love of the native-land, firing upon unarmed crowds, the unutterable sufferings and humiliations inflicted on the people under excuse of martial

law! Where outside India have such things been permitted in modern times? Yet Sir George Younghusband would have the English public believe that officials in India are not 'free to govern.' These officials have governed too 'freely,' they have been unchecked in their autocracy by the Parliament and the Indian people,—with the result that the situation has become worse year after year; and your puny; 'Reforms' cannot arrest it. Accept the advice of these race-imperialists and maintain the insensate policy of force or repression; and you may be sure of one thing; you will lose India—for ever.

In his evidence before the Hunter Committee, General Dyer spoke bluntly as to his motive in firing upon the unarmed crowd. It was, he said, no longer a question of merely dispersing the crowd, but one of producing a sufficient moral effect! And his callous deed *has* produced a moral effect! Non-co-operation! There has passed over the country the spirit of a strong moral protest against the present system.

The Amritsar affair is the darkest stain on the British rule in India.

O'Dwyer and Dyer said Mr. Neil Maclean at a London Meeting, 'should be placed in a pri-

soner's dock and tried for murder.' No certificates from Mr. Montagu or Lord Sydenham can hide the fact that Sir Michael's repressive policy was at the root of the Punjab troubles. As for General Dyer and the martial law commissioners—can their actions be honestly defended? Firing on men who were not in arms, who were not rebels, firing on them without warning, firing on them till the ammunition was exhausted, bombing and machine-gunning by aeroplanes on a civil population, flogging a wedding party, making students march for miles together under the summer sun, compelling men to crawl, dragging veiled women into the market and stripping them naked—is it possible to condone such atrocities?

Yet there are Englishmen who support the authors of the callous deeds as 'the brave men who saved India from a second Mutiny'! 'It would be difficult' writes an Anglo-Indian to the *Pioneer*, "to find one white man or woman or even—up to the present, thank God—one Indian soldier who does not stand up for General Dyer . . . The white people in India realise that they owe their lives to him and are fully determined to express their appreciation of his services in some appropriate form!" So

Sir O'Moore Creagh, late Commander-in-Chief in India gives a glowing testimonial to General Dyer. General Dyer, he says, was quite right in what he did, and the people who are to blame are those who allowed the Congress to assemble in Amritsar! The Army Council declares even the findings of the Hunter Committee against General Dyer to be *ultra vires*, because, forsooth, General Dyer had no legal adviser! The Army Council exonerates General Dyer on the ground that he had 'no alternative, faced as he was by a grave crisis, but to ask with promptness and decision and take drastic measures!' The Hunter Committee itself accuses General Dyer of no more than 'a grave error of judgment' in 'prolonging the firing' on the crowd!

The tragedy of the matter is that General Dyer is no exception among Englishmen. Many of them conveniently believe that they belong to a 'superior' race, that we of India are an 'inferior' people who must be kept by force within the Empire which needs raw products of the Orient, that there must be two state-moralities, one for England, the other for India and Egypt! The Imperialist's creed is—'The Englishman, right or wrong!' So the *prestige* of 'God's.



Englishman must always be placed above the 'rights' of 'these Orientals' Imperialism is the Doctrine of the Chosen Race; it is in conflict with the other world-view which I call *humanism*. To it India has borne witness through the ages; it refuses to regard a 'nation' as the 'inferior' of another; it believes in plurality of nations; it believes that nations, will differ, one from the other, in qualities and equipments, as among men some will be short, some tall,—but that each has a contribution of its own to make to the growing life of humanity and that, therefore, *freedom* is the birth right of every nation, no matter how small or weak. The Parliament has screened the evil doers, and so eaten every political principle it has professed since the war.

Is there a parallel to the Amritsar atrocities in the pages of modern history? I know of none. It is fashionable to-day to abuse Germany, Germany lost the War, and the cheapest thing is to abuse the vanquished! But when did a German General deal with his Emperor's subjects as Gen. Dyer did with Indian subjects of King George? Were such a deed done in England, the men responsible for it would be tried for murder. And we easily understand

the anxiety of Sir Michael O'Dwyer to secure sympathy for himself and his comrades by telling the British public that there was in the Punjab an 'organised conspiracy' to overthrow British rule in India! The long letter which Sir Michael sent to the English press was made much of by Anglo-Indian writers; the *Times* gave it only 3 quarters of a column; Anglo-Indian papers gave it nearly 6 columns. And Sir Michael's long-drawn 'defence' comes to this:—there was a rebellious conspiracy, and the situation could only be saved by militarism! There was in his letter not a word to show that he or any of his associates felt any compunction of conscience for the murder.

There was a 'rebellious movement.' And Sir Michael related it to 'Afghan aggression.' Sir Michael said that the Punjab disturbances were 'in some ways more serious' even than the Mutiny of 1857! "But they collapsed speedily," Sir Michael argued, "because prompt measures were taken by the Government."! "General Dyer's action at Amritsar," he adds "smashed the rebellion at its source"! There *was* no rebellion! Several even of the official witnesses before the Hunter Commission definitely affirmed that they were unaware of any

conspiracy in the Punjab to overthrow the British rule; the Officer Commanding said:—"I had nothing to do with the bringing in of Martial Law," and Indian members on the Hunter Committee, carefully chosen by Government as gentlemen conspicuous for 'moderate' views, came to the conclusion that "there was no rebellion which required to be crushed."

The whole of Sir Michael's letter became heavily stupid when it insinuated that the 'British officials' in their 'arduous and often thankless task' of safeguarding 'the interest of the voiceless millions' had to 'face constant obloquy and misrepresentation' flung by 'the small educated minority who are able to make their voices heard in India and in England'! Why is Government, despite its 'publicity' departments, its *Sachai* journals, its spies and agents, its power and resources, its showers of titles and favours on the flatterers—why is Government, I ask, unable to make *its* voice heard? The truth is the 'voiceless millions' do *not* trust the *sircar*, the 'voiceless millions' have seen through the game of setting them against the 'small educated minority.'

The one thing the British official in India seldom forgets is that he belongs to a 'superior'

race ; and he conveniently ignores the fact that he has to deal with a refined people, a people who have made rich contributions to the higher life of humanity. Gen. Dyer said in his evidence before the Hunter Committee that he had to carry out his threat of opening fire 'for fear of looking like a fool' ! 'It was not my business,' he added, 'to look to the medical arrangement for the wounded' ! So Major Carberry, the man who threw bombs on unarmed men and women, said :—'the crowd was running away and I fired to *disperse* them' ! Not even the lower animals must, according to Indian instincts, be treated thus. And it is the higher instincts of Asiatic humanity which the British official's race-imperialism has ruthlessly trampled upon, again and again. The Amritsar atrocities have unmasked the real mentality of race-imperialism. India has worshipped the Vision Universal, has adored Humanity through the ages : and India will not countenance an imperialism which would have one race dominate another and frighten freedom into silence by 'blood and iron.' The strength of a Government morally bankrupt must fail of its effect on a people who have produced a Buddha and a Nanak. Such strength is weakness.

Is it possible to co-operate with those who have trampled upon their pledges and the Muslim sentiments in their 'peace' settlement with Turkey? Is it possible to co-operate with a Government that has no respect for Indian opinion and believes in force as the basis of the State?

Turkey has been treated as a pawn in the game of European politics. The London Conference offered some concessions to Turkey, but the wrongs to Islam remain. British Imperialism has compromised with the policy of France without abandoning the essential features of its programme which aims at an economic exploitation and a strategic dominance of the East.

It must not be forgotten that France has been anxious to play Turkey against Russia; and some of the concessions offered to the Turkish Nationalist aim at averting the danger of an alliance of the Young Turk with the Bolshevik. France, too, has been anxious to break the force of Greece, and the restoration of Constantine has made it necessary that England's Turkish policy must no longer be subservient to Greek intrigues. Some of the acquisitions of Greece have, accordingly, been made over to Turkey.

The concessions offered to the Turk check the ambitions of Greece; but what about the ambitions of British and French Imperialisms? There is not a word in the cabled report to indicate that England and France are prepared to give up their 'mandates' in the East! That France would evacuate Cilicia was talked of months ago, in the French Senate and Chamber; but what about French ambitions in Syria? The Syrians do not want France as a 'mandatory.' A Syrian paper, *Mirut-ul-Ghrab* wrote, some time ago;—"England who lays her hand on Ireland and Egypt without ever assuming a mandate over them or considering herself called upon to reform them, does not treat the people of these two countries as France has treated the Libanon people in their own country. Yet France claims to have come to Syria to protect, not colonise! We cannot reconcile her words and her actions." It was a French General who expounding at Marseilles the French policy in Syria confessed, with the frankness of a soldier, that France was anxious to be in Syria, because Syria was a "very rich country," and the 'mandate' was a "paying affair"! And what about the British 'mandates' in Mesopotamia? That, too, is believed to be a "paying affair",

and it is required also for 'strategic' purposes by British imperialism! The "Near East Settlement" must not disturb these "mandates"! The Allies promise to evacuate Constantinople; but the "Straits" and "Thrace" are to be "internationalised" which would mean, in practice, dominated by Britain and France. Armenia, I am glad, is promised freedom, to make any little nation free is to render a service to humanity. Turkey, we are told, is permitted to join the 'League of Nations,' but this 'League of Nations' is really a League of Exploiters and what stability can it have as long as Russia stands outside? What about the Holy Places of Islam? What about the Premier's pledges to Muslims during the War? A "non-official Englishman," writing, some time ago, to the *manchester Guardian* made a significant confession. "It must be admitted," he observed, "that what they (Indians) read in the public press as to our policy in Mesopotamia, Palestine the Hedjaz and elsewhere would hardly remove an impression of British bad faith. The lofty sentiments, enunciated by the Allies in General and by the British in particular in the heat of the conflict, seemed to the Indian mind to have given way to a universal scramble for territorial

aggrandisement the minute that Victory had declared itself in our favour."

The concessions of the London Conference can not satisfy Indian Muslims; and if Mr. Lloyd George thought he could conciliate Muslim sentiment thus and then break the force of non-co-operation by detaching the Mahomedans from the Movement, he would be deeply disappointed. The Muslim sentiment cannot be conciliated until the integrity of the Khilafat is secured; and Muslim India will not leave the Hindus alone in the National Struggle. For Muslims know to-day that the one safeguard of Islam and the one guarantee of national progress and prosperity is—*Hind Swaraj*.

Can the 'concessions' of the London Conference pacify the East? Can they conciliate the 4 main causes of uneasiness to British Imperialism—the Muslim sentiment, the Turkish Nationalism, the Bolshevik menace, the Non-Co-operation Movement? The Muslim sentiment cannot be satisfied as long as the integrity of the Khilafat remains disturbed. The Bolshevik menace has been talked of by British statesmen, over and over again. "The War Office Committee," according to an English paper, "has pointed to the Middle East as the future fighting-ground



of Indian troops. It is a danger zone in British relations with Russia, the possibilities are serious." And 'concessions' have been made to Kemal Pasha, with a view, doubtless, to detach him and his party from a Bolshevist alliance. Several weeks ago, a correspondent in a French paper, the *Gaulois*, earnestly asked the Allies to win the friendship of Kemal Pasha in order to upset the Bolshevik plans in the East! He wrote:—"If we bring Kemal over to our side, then from the Caucasus to Persia, the followers of the Green Flag will rid themselves of the yoke that the 'Reds' would be impotent to maintain through force. This would mean the collapse of their projects. The peace conditions of the Kemalists are reasonable, and instead of losing them by disputes among ourselves, the Allied Premiers should recognise the presence of the world-wide Bolshevik menace, with calculation." Will the concessions of the London Conference reconcile Turkish Nationalists to the programme of Western imperialism in the East and effect a breach between them and the Bolsheviks? Here is what a correspondent of the "*Daily Express*" wrote, only a few weeks ago:—"A prominent (Turkish) Nationalist has told me that they did not desire the

*modification* of the Treaty to which the (Turkish) Nationalists had never agreed, but *an entirely new treaty*. When asked what they would do if the Allies insisted, he replied that they would continue fighting; he added they were certain of victory; the Bolsheviks were backing them."

The 'concessions' dictated by the Allies to Turkey are not calculated to secure a solid settlement in the East. Russia has its interest in Asia no less than Britain and France. Islam is not conciliated. As the Amir of Afghanistan said in his message to Mustapha Kemal Pasha :—" We have signified to these our brethren (representatives of Turkish Nationalists) that henceforth the watchword of all the Muslim communities will be:—'sacrifice for the cause of Muslim Independence' in which our Nation will take its due shape." Europe has come in conflict with Islam and the new nationalisms of Eastern peoples. Europe must conciliate them; and the only way to do it is to abandon imperialist aims and programmes. Will Europe do the one thing needful? Will it give up its 'mandates' in the Middle East and help India to achieve *swaraj*? Unfortunately, as the French Prime Minister said the other day,

"International politics to-day are oil-politics"; and the politics of Indian Government are dominated by imperial interests. The purpose of non-co-operation is to break the force of an imperialism which is a danger to Civilization ; it is to make India and the East safe for Freedom.

## INDIA'S CHALLENGE

Lord Chelmsford's view that non-cooperation would die of inanition has been abandoned since the great decision was taken at Calcutta.

The old pretence of regarding the new movement with contempt has been abandoned; and the feeling is growing in England that a 'perilous crisis' has arisen in the East. The "Observer" of London referred to Mr. Gandhi as 'an exalted idealist of concentrated sincerity.' But the *Times* is in no mood to speak of him in such terms. It calls the great Indian leader "the unbalanced fanatic who has wrought much mischief in India"! This man has broken the prestige of the bureaucracy; that were 'mischief,' indeed!

Referring to non-cooperation, the *Observer* of London wrote:—"There has been nothing like it. It would wreck Reform, if the extremists get their way, before it could shake the pillars of British rule." Non-co-operation *has* wrecked the 'Reforms.'

*Times* says that "deliberate refusal on anything like a national scale to take part in the working of the Reform Act would be heart-breaking for all who have hoped that the Act would be the beginning of a New Era in India." This statement is a confession. Non-co-operation on a national scale would certainly mean rejection of the Reform Act, but when was the country pleased with it? And who, except a few believed that the Act would open a "New Era" in India? The *Times* urges that India must not take Egypt as an example. "It was only when boycott in Egypt was tacitly, if not openly, given up" it says, "that the proposals of the Milner Mission could be made to the Egyptian Nationalists." It suits the *Times* to make light of Egypt's non-cooperation, 'boycott' as it calls it, but facts are an eloquent vindication of the policy of non-cooperation in Egypt. Whatever the *Times* and Anglo-Indian apologists of the Government may say, the significant fact is there that 'the proposals of the Milner Mission' did not begin till *after* the 'boycott'; and even the *Times* admits that the boycott was not 'openly' given up. It is useless asking the world to believe in 'altruism' of the British Government. Government made

concessions to Egyptian nationalism under *pressure of circumstances* created by Egyptian non-co-operation and the world forces.

The *Times* is sorry that Mr. Gandhi is 'now' hailed as 'Mahatma'. The *Times* takes Mr. Montagu to task for praising Mr. Gandhi in the Commons; Mr. Gandhi, we are told, 'has elevated to a fine art' 'a particular form of saintly turbulence'! The *Times*, indeed, goes so far as to doubt the purity of his motive and to dub him an agitator. He "professes," it says, "to abhor violence but constantly preaches doctrines which he must know are bound to produce the worst forms of violence amongst the ignorant masses who are his dupes!" The National Congress endorsed the policy of non-co-operation; did the Congress consist of "ignorant masses"? And is it not true that alike the 'classes' the 'masses' in India abhor 'violence'? But the *Times* and its Anglo-Indian informants conjure up 'violence' on every imaginable occasion. "Our Bombay correspondent says," the *Times* seriously writes, "that in Guzrat, the Northern Province of Bombay Presidency, bloodshed is anticipated on the polling day, presumably as a consequence of attempts to prevent votes from being recorded"! The polling day is over; who heard of

'bloodshed' in any part of the Bombay Presidency?

The *Times* waxes eloquent over the thought that 'the moderate leaders have repudiated' non-cooperation, 'Moderate leaders'! Where are they? and where those they lead? The 'Moderate leaders' wield little influence to-day; and the 'moderate combination' has not been able to check the progress of non-cooperation. The 'election' results in the Presidency show that the great majority of the voters have rejected the 'Reforms' and boycotted the Councils "The proposed boycott of the election," the *Times* says, "seems likely to be at least partially effective." The boycott of the election in the Bombay Presidency has been not partially but substantially effective. And this shows *not* that the people are not fitted to control their own affairs, but that they recognise the illusory character of the 'Reforms' the people have rejected what the *Times* calls the 'new 'privileges' granted them by Great Britain; the people have rejected the 'Reforms.' The reason is not far to seek. They want *swaraj*; they are not satisfied with a few 'transferred' subjects.

The right way to meet the challenge of non-

co-operation is to deal justly with the people's demands. But British statesmanship is Bankrupt to-day; and the *Times* suggests that the movement of non-co-operation should be speedily crushed. "It becomes necessary to ask," it says, "how long Mr. Gandhi is to be permitted to set India in a ferment whenever he chooses." How long? What is there wrong, I ask, about non-violent non-co-operation? A Government cannot compel gentlemen to bear titles or receive honours. It cannot compel students to study in its schools and colleges. It cannot compel citizens to accept offices. It cannot compel them to take their civil cases to its courts. It cannot compel them to buy foreign goods. It is open to it, notwithstanding, to take the high, courageous line or coercion! It is open to it to arrest Mr. Gandhi and his comrades. But no arrests can arrest the Movement.

The *Morning Post* says the Congress is "neither deliberative nor national." The withdrawal from election of several candidates in different parts of the country should make these critics wiser in his estimate of the *national* character of the Congress; and the surrender of votes by the majority of voters is yet another



proof of the strength of the Movement of Non-co-operation.

It is useless belittling the Movement. The Message of Non-co-operation is spreading fast. The Indian People are sick of the present Administration. They have rejected the Reforms, the Montagu Reform Bill, as *India* says, is a sham. They understand that mendicancy will not secure them *swaraj*. They realise that 'nations are by themselves made.' They know that the wrong to the Punjab has not been redressed. They understand that British promises to preserve the integrity of the Khilafat, no less than Muslim religious sentiments have been most ruthlessly trampled upon by the Turkish Treaty. "After five hundred years," wrote the *Morning Post* with joy, "the Turkish Power disappears for all practical purposes from Europe and, as far as human eye can see, without the faintest chance of ever retrieving its position"! In the situation created by these circumstances, is it possible for any self-respecting Muslim or Hindu to give the hand of fellowship to Government?

Non-cooperation is the Nation's demand for justice and freedom. The demand grows in strength every week, every month. India's

masses have begun to understand the meaning of non-co-operation; and the classes are bound to feel the overwhelming pressure of public opinion and escape the forces bred and fostered by a bureaucracy that believes in imperialism and the cult of power. The 'sufferings and wrongs' of India 'have reached breaking point'; said *India*. And this English journal proceeded to point out that 'Indians are determined, whatever the cost, whatever the suffering, to become free'. It added the significant words:—"If Britain trifles with the cry for justice and freedom which goes up from the whole Indian people, she must look to lose India as she has lost Egypt, as she is losing Ireland. This is the issue which it is the duty of the friends of Britain and India in this country to press upon the British people." This is the issue which is being pressed upon British democracy by the progress of the Movement of Non-co-operation. Let non-co-operation be seriously tried on a national scale; and Government will realise its utter powerlessness and come to terms with the Nation.

An American journal,—the *Literary Digest* of New York—gives a portrait of Mahatma Gandhi with the following words underneath

it:—"Saint or Sinner?"! It is easy to understand why the great Leader is "execrated by many Englishmen as India's evil genius" An Englishman confessed that Gandhiji was an idealist, but added,— "It is precisely his idealism which makes him the worst enemy of his own people"! Misrepresentation of the man and his work is what we must expect of the foreigners who are not in sympathy with India's struggle for Freedom I recall the mischievous words of the writer in the *Times* who observed concerning Mahatma Gandhi — "He professes to abhor violence, but constantly preaches doctrines which he must know are bound to produce the worst forms of violence among the ignorant masses who are his dupes" And again.— "India has had enough and more than enough, of the particular form of saintly turbulence which Mr. Gandhi has elevated to a fine art" One thing made much of is that the movement of non-co-operation consists of 'ignorant' 'masses,' and that 'Mr. Gandhi preaches to the heart and despises the head.' The critics forget that the Movement is supported also by the several intellectuals, and that Mahatma Gandhi always aims at a logical analysis and interpretation of the Indian situation.

The programme of non-co-operation is banned as the 'Sinn-Fein programme'! This misses the essential point of the Indian Movement, *viz.*, that it is a movement pledged to non-violence. Emphasis on self-reliance,—is the point common to the programmes of Sinn-Fein and non-co-operation. We do not believe in the 'Reforms'; we believe that India must work out her salvation herself. "To get *swaraj*," says Mahatma Gandhi, "is to get rid of our helplessness." But to outgrow this helplessness we must use soul-force, not violence. We rely on the power of pure self-sacrifice, not the power of the sword. Yet an English writer says the 'danger,' 'the very real danger,' of Mahatma Gandhi lies in the fact, that, if adopted, non-co-operation will 'lead in India to internecine bloodshed and disintegration and, should our long patience become exhausted, to Indian servitude to some other Power more willing than ourselves to keep the sabre rattling in its sheath'. This forgets the essentials of non-co-operation. Non-co-operation cannot succeed without National Unity; and if India maintains Unity and achieves *swaraj*, what 'Power' is there which can snatch *swaraj* from her by 'rattling the sabre in its sheath'? What has stood in the

way of India so long is the feeling encouraged by the Englishman that she must depend upon some 'other Power' for her internal and external security. So it is that the military expenditure continues to increase, year after year; and advocates of Government plead inability to reduce the military burden because there is always this 'menace' or that,—from the 'Afghan' or the Bolshevik—to India! And the menace, we are told, must be guarded against by a big army! It is impossible to have internal development of India as long as she is made to pay for a huge army. The way to make India secure against foreign aggression is *not*, to maintain a strong army but to maintain a strong Hindu-Muslim Unity. That Unity has come through non-co-operation, and in that Unity, I believe, is the Promise and Potency of a Free Indian Nation.

"Unpractical fanaticism" is the *Daily Telegraph's* comment on the policy of non-co-operation; '*practical idealism*' is interpretation of the policy. It involves, says the English paper "the ruin of Indian industries!" It is easy to understand the anxiety of a British paper to condemn a movement which seeks to help the indigenous industries of India; but it is not

right to identify British trade with "Indian industries" The one thing repeatedly urged by opponents of the New Movement is that it will lead to 'anarchy.'

The *Daily Telegraph* emphasises 'the danger of the attempt of Mr. Gandhi and his associates to rouse the badmashes,' and urges that non-co-operation, if left to itself, will end in 'the reduction of India to anarchy!' The critics forget that the Movement is meant to be essentially moral, that it relies not on physical force but on moral strength, that its watchword is *not* violence but renunciation, self-sacrifice. Even the *Englishman* is constrained to say:—"It is due to Indian leaders that the programme of non-co-operation has not caused any of the scenes of violence and disorder that were feared. There were grave fears last September that any attempt to put the programme into operation would cause destruction of property and life. But nothing of that kind has happened and one of the reasons why we say the situation to-day is not dangerous is because non-co-operation, as far as it has gone, has not provoked violence."

The unexpected success of non-co-operation has upset the critics. The New Movement is

not dying; it is very much alive; it must be checked! The *Daily Telegraph* insists on "more rigorous measures of repression than the Executive has yet thought proper to employ;" and the *Morning Post* says a "strong Viceroy is needed immediately, one who is not a politician but a soldier or nobleman of character and of approved wisdom in dealing with men." A soldier-Viceroy! A more rigorous policy of repression! And if we will but meet the developing situation with moral strength, with faith in our Future, with the power of loyalty to the Indian Ideals, the New Spirit, we may be sure, will only grow from more to more. For, Freedom thrives on sufferings of the just.

The *Westminster Gazette* makes a significant confession when it says — "If India is to be stampeded into boycott of the new Councils, a position will be created that will destroy the Reform Scheme from the beginning. *That would create a difficult situation for ourselves*" (italics mine) It does; the Councils being boycotted by nationalists, the bureaucracy's character as an *irresponsible power* stands clearly revealed to the civilized world. It is true there have been found Indians

to enter the Councils; but many of them carry little weight, and the world will not swallow the bait that the Councils *represent the* people.

Proceeding further, the *Westminster Gazette* says:—"We cannot be unconcerned when we see all over India Mahomedans and Hindus are joining to espouse each other's causes and the latter taking up, with an appearance of enthusiasm, the Muslim grievances in regard to the Turkish Treaty and the Khilafat." This, too, is a significant confession. The *Westminster Gazette* understands what I have often urged, that this 'non-co-operation' is really Hindu-Muslim Co-operation in the service of Truth and Freedom; and I am not surprised to read that the English paper views this co-operation of Muslims and Hindus with deep concern. Hindu-Muslim solidarity, as I have repeatedly said, is the greatest guarantee of India's future.



## THE HEART OF THE STRUGGLE

"Nothing," wrote the *Manchester Guardian* "can be more foolish than to under-rate the power of a single vigorous personality directed with perfect disinterestedness to just ends." There was a time when some correspondents of the British Press made it a point to belittle the power and influence of Mahatma Gandhi. The British public were told that the country was not with him, that the agitation would die down soon, that the movement would fizzle out. The British public now know better. Sir Valentine Chirol, a strong Imperialist, in his articles in the *Times* on the situation in India bears testimony to the tremendous influences of Mahatma Gandhi and his message of Non-Cooperation. Sir Valentine gives the British public some idea of the great meeting—over 35,000 people attended it—which Mahatma Gandhi addressed at Allahabad on the eve of the elections. "The next day," writes Sir Valentine, "showed how potent his spell could

be. The presiding officer with his assistants sat at his table with the freshly-printed electoral roll in front of him and the voting papers to be handed over to each voter before he passed into the inner sanctuary in which the ballot-boxes awaited him. But from 8 in the morning till past 12, not a single voter had presented himself out of over 1,200 assigned to this polling station, nor did a single one present himself in the course of the whole day ! ”

It is no wonder the movement of non-co-operation, regarded with contempt some time ago, is now viewed with anxiety by the British public. The situation in India, writes an English paper, is certainly not free from anxiety. And the *Morning Post* writes :—“ There are really only two alternatives before the British people—either to rule India or to get out of India. The plan of giving India self-government was never anything more than a pretext or an illusion. And if the British people do not want to get out of India, then they must continue to rule India.” *The plan of giving India self-government was never anything more than a pretext or an illusion !* A significant confession this ! And the country has rejected this ‘ pretext ’ or illusion of ‘ reforms.’ The British do

not want to get out of India, Indians do not want them to get out of India, what Indians insist upon is that hence forth they and the British must live on equal terms on terms honourable to both, must work together as comrades in the one service of a Free India. 'To rule India by physical force, by machine guns may please Dyer and his friends; it will not help the British nor that plan of Civilization which needs the co-operation of Free Peoples for the service of Humanity. The movement of non-co-operation is a protest against rule by force. It was a great-hearted Englishman who said at Glasgow, some time ago — "It was time those should speak out who believed it was better the Empire should cease rather than it should continue by force". They blunder badly who, like the writer in the *Times of India*, confound the New movement with a movement of Anarchy. Non-co-operation is really a protest of India's soul against rule by force. As Mahatma Gandhi explained to Sir Valentine in the course of a private talk — "India has at last recovered her own soul through the fiery ordeal" of the Punjab and the Khilafat wrongs. Yes, India has at last recovered her Soul. Government is stretching

forth the arm of repression; Government is sowing the seed of deeper unrest. Individual workers and leaders may be clapped in jail or gagged to silence; but the awakened Soul of India goes marching on

## MISSING THE MEANING OF THE MOVEMENT

Non-co-operation, as I have pointed out more than once, is no longer dismissed by its critics as a contemptible little thing. An English paper referring to the Congress decision says that 'a perilous crisis' has 'abruptly arisen' in India, that 'there has been nothing like it', that 'it would wreck reform, if the extremists get their way before it could shake the pillars of British rule'! The one thing which can wreck the movement is *not* repression on the part of Government but violence on the part of the people. And the one thing its critics now harp upon is that it would lead to violence. It is, unfortunately, true that there are some non-co-operationists who use violent words in criticising the conduct of co-operationists. Thus a Gujarati candidate for the Council received a letter from a non-co-operationist to this effect: "If you do not withdraw, I shall not let you remain on the

surface of the earth. We shall make you homeless"! Commenting on this letter in the *Navajivan*, Mahatma Gandhi rightly says—"As long as there are such men, we are to be ashamed." I do not, for a moment, defend the conduct of the candidates who sought election to the Councils against public opinion; but a gentleman could stand as a candidate with the most honest motives; and it is not for us to intimidate or boycott him. Mrs. Beasant in her recent address at Allahabad said all men who were going into the Council were doing so at a sacrifice, that they "were pinching their families in order that they may give service to their country"! Mrs. Beasant's remark was resented by a large number of young men who cried out "no, no sacrifice." It is *not* true that all who go to the Councils are inspired by the idea of nation-service; but neither is it true to say that all candidates are self-seeking; and what a non-co-operationist should do is not to abuse or attack the candidates but to convince, as many as he can, by reason and by the example of his own character. The sustaining power of non-co-operation is not hate or strife but self-suffering, sacrifice.

It is all the more regrettable, therefore, that

the charge of violence is hurled at non-co-operation. The "Observer" of London tells its readers that Mr Gandhi is "an exalted idealist of concentrated sincerity, restlessly urged by feeling and deaf to all prudential arguments;" and it proceeds to attack non-co-operation on the ground that it would 'open the flood gates of anarchy,' that it might 'soon break into violence', that 'Mr Gandhi is the kind of man who raises these whirlwinds but not the kind of man who can rein them' and that the Government 'must be well prepared' for 'passionate and formidable convulsions' which Mr Gandhi may create! So Mrs. Beasant has said, again and again, that non-co-operation would lead to violence. And a recent issue of *New India* says the time has come to 'definitely oppose and actively combine' against non-co-operation which, it adds, "is now seen quite clearly to be a net which is catching within it impulsive youths and elements of lawlessness too dangerous to be ignored much longer"! Those who write thus miss the essential meaning of the movement, and I am afraid play into the hands of the bureaucracy. Can bureaucratic repression have a better justification than this.—Non-co-operation leads to violence? One cannot

emphasise too often the fact that our non-co-operation is of a non-violent character. It is meant to discipline our lives; it is meant to purify the administration; it is meant to build India on sacrifice. That it will succeed wonderfully if we will not kill it by any violence on our part is my daily-deepening belief. For, as an English paper confessed a few days ago;—‘Indian co-operation is necessary for the British Raj’.



## INDIA'S ULTIMATUM

A reverend gentleman went out of his way, the other day, to condemn non-co-operation 'as an impossible thing.' So was the Teaching of Christ condemned by the worldly wise when the Master moved about doing good. There are critics who regard the movement as foolish. One is reminded of the words spoken by St. Paul to the Roman official — "I am not mad, most noble Festus." Mr. Gandhi is not mad, he is a practical man, and the movement is pre-eminently practical. Non-co-operation has, during a short period, created a situation which neither the bureaucracy nor British opinion can brush aside as a matter of no consequence. Non-co-operation has *not* 'fizzled out'; non-co-operation is not dying; non-co-operation is spreading: the Ceylon National Congress has endorsed it. "The situation of India is extremely critical", writes the *Labour Leader*. "The decision", it adds, "of the Special Indian National Congress to institute a total boycott

of the British Government may have very serious consequences." And frightened by the progress of the New Movement, the *Pioneer* which has not been conspicuous for love of the Indian makes a frantic appeal for 'whole-hearted co-operation between Indians and Europeans', with a view to give 'every effect to the political aspirations of Indians towards complete self-government'! Imagine the *Pioneer* appealing to "Indians and Europeans to sink all past differences and work together for a common goal"! Who will say non-co-operation has proved ineffectual?

Other critics of the non-co-operation there are who see in it dangerous possibilities; to them non-co-operation is the seed of anarchy and violence. *New India* is a critic of this class. And I who have profound respect for Mrs. Beasant, regret very much that her organ should make repeated attacks, in a manner not worthy of its nobler traditions, upon Mahatma Gandhi. In an article, *New India* says:—"The destruction of the Rights of the Nation is going on at the hands of Mr. Gandhi and his followers to a much greater extent than happened in the days of the unrestricted power of the bureaucracy"! "They are already establish-

ing a tyranny," adds *New India*. The strong public opinion, becoming stronger every day in favour of non-co-operation is, according to *New India*, a 'tyranny' worse than 'the unrestricted power of the bureaucracy'! *New India* damns Mr. Gandhi as the 'Dictator' and non-co-operationists as "the followers of Dictator" "who take up the role the bureaucracy has surrendered"! Indeed, *New India* goes so far as to accuse Mahatma Gandhi of "stirring up the passions of the people at this critical moment"!

While *New India* attacks non-co-operation as a "crusade against human rights initiated by Mr. Gandhi," it is interesting to note that there are Englishmen who appreciate some aspects of the new movement.

Col Wedgwood admits that non-co-operation is largely a "rebellion against slave-mentality a mental insurrection;" he understands that the purposes of 'practical politics' is the "construction" of New India; but how, I ask, is such construction possible, without a "protest against slave-mentality?" There can be no *New India* without a new mentality; and non-co-operation is meant to develop this new mentality. The Colonel recognises that the new movement is based on "a constant assertion of the duty of

self-sacrifice." The movement, also, emphasises the duty of *self-reliance* and the duty of *self-discipline*. And it is regrettable that there are also critics of the movement who charge it with encouraging violence.

'A national paper examines the "fruits of non-co-operation;" some of these it refers to in the following words:—"The name of India dragged in the mud; cowardice made the price of popularity; and hypocrisy the price of public respect." This misses the purpose of a movement which is essentially a Gospel of self-help, self-purification and self-sacrifice? Col. Wedgwood, I am glad, recognises the error of his earlier view. "I had thought," he says, "that the non-co-operation movement must end in violence. I am more hopeful now." Indeed, he thinks 'much good must come' from the movement. He is mistaken, however, in thinking that it is a purely *negative* movement; the *name* is negative but the *motive* and *method* are positive; the movement is primarily one of self-organisation, of reconstruction of Indian life on a basis of self-respect and freedom. Equally mistaken is Col. Wedgwood when he says,—"The intelligentsia of India, the lawyers, the responsible thinkers, seem to be dropping

out of the movement, retiring like Achilles to their tents." The "intelligentsia of India" and 'lawyers' were present at the Nagpur Congress no less than merchants and the masses. There was a time when critics of the Congress complained that it represented only a small class of the 'educated'; now that the masses are in sympathy with the national ideals, we are told by critics that the Congress is become a movement of the masses. The truth is the National Congress at Nagpur represented the 'educated' as well as the 'masses'; the Liberal Federation, Madras, had about 350 delegates only, but the Nagpur Congress was representative of different classes and communities, it was national.

Mr. Knight writes, in the movement of non-co-operation he sees India's effort to assert and establish civil freedom. Mr Ben Spoor, too, appreciates the meaning and message of non-co-operation "I realise," he said on another occasion, "that behind your movement there are centuries of spiritual training. There is a spiritual support to keep your movement clean and pure. Your efforts will make England free from material ideals. The world is full of shadows but the prison for freedom was never

stronger. A Free India way means a Free Britain and together we can go forward to secure the world for a Free Humanity " Mr. A. F. Brockway points out the policy of non-co-operation means that " India is entering upon the road which was first travelled triumphantly during the last century by Hungary, which has gained independence for Egypt and which is steadily making an alien government impossible in Ireland." Mr. Brockway sees that if non-co-operation be practised by 'any considerable proportion of the Indian peoples,' 'the British military autocracy in India cannot continue long' To non-co-operate is to assert the right of self-determination. "India's experiment," Mr. Brockway adds, "will be watched with intense interest by lovers of freedom throughout the world." And the most hopeful condition for the success of this Experiment is Hindu-Muslim Unity.

## TO LIBERTY

What can it mean—this challenge of repression ?

Ibsen congratulated Tourgenieff, an eminent Russian writer, upon living under a stern bureaucracy. We are having our stern self-education, for freedom under the bureaucracy. Therefore be patient, self controlled, my Muslim friends! Complain not, but stand the test as believers.

It is not for us to blame the bureaucracy. It, doubtless, desired at first that there be a 'peaceful penetration' of anti-Khilafat views. It soon found out its mistake, its friends could not kill the Khilafat cause by propaganda; it has launched now a policy of rigorous repression! It warned; it suspended pensions; it threatened to press the Seditious Meetings Act against Khilafat speakers: the movement continued to spread among the masses; the *Englishman* pointed out that the Act was 'useless,' and advised the "arrest and punishment of persons

for sedition.' The bureaucracy acted up to the suggestion. There have been arrests of a number of Khilafatists; rumours of more arrest are in the air, and the Sind bureaucracy's staunch friend, the local *Gazette*, is clearing the ground by charging me and my friends, Seth Haji Abdulla Haroon and Mr. Jeswani with 'the will to bring about disorder,' 'the fervent desire to stir up trouble!' Spies, informers, and the secret police are at their time-honoured work; and I can easily believe 'files of information' are multiplying fast.

A critical situation, I am told, is being created in the movement. To me in the silence of the the night, the voice of *kismet* sounds each minute the words:—"What is to be, will be." I know not the hour nor the day. One thing I feel:—"Swaraaj is to be, and *will be*."

'Whose turn next?' ask the People in this Province.

Whose turn next? Any one of us may be clapped into jail any moment. Criticism is damned as sedition. Every word of remonstrance is regarded as sedition. In every national *mantra* they smell sedition. If you preach non-cooperation, you are seditious. If you say the Premier has broken his pledge, you are seditious.



If you say you trusted government too long and will not trust it any more,—until its heart is changed,—you are seditious. If you say you want self-rule, *swaraj*, you are seditious. If you claim for India what every Englishman would claim for England, you are seditious. If you stand by Islam in the hour of its anguish, you are seditious. Governments punish *violence*, I know; but here *opinions* and *patriotism* are penalised! “Where does it lead,—this repression?”—was the question put me. “To Liberty,”—was my reply.

It is the *expected* which happens. I believe whatever, is, is for the best,—if only we face it with *moral strength*. It seems to me that in the developing situation we and the bureaucracy are on trial. And the trial will be of *moral strength*.

We must not complain; and if for our faith in freedom and the crime of loving our country and having friendship with the Mussulman, the Sind bureaucracy regards us as ‘seditious,’ then must we plead ‘guilty’ and take jail for honour. The bureaucracy smells sedition everywhere. When I spoke first of ‘swadeshi,’ some wise men of the Sind *sircar* thought I was talking ‘seditious’! In Bengal, Sir Bampfylde Fuller person-

ally compelled the leading men of Barisal to withdraw their swadeshi appeal to villagers! And when some boys created petty disturbance at Serajgunj, Patna, this bureaucrat of Bengal punished the two schools concerned by posting punitive police and demanding their disaffiliation from the Calcutta University! When Anglo-Indian papers abuse educated Indians calling them 'base-born B.A.'s,' 'beggars on horse-back,' 'servile class, etc., etc.,' not a word of rebuke is administered by the *ma lap* bureaucracy; but if we reply to such imperialist and racial flanders and expose the policy and measures of the Administration we are damned 'seditious.' What nobler conception of patriotism than is embodied in the beautiful song of '*Bande Mataram*'? Yet the very words '*Bande Mataram*' were, at one time, prohibited by more than one official; and a kind-hearted Englishman gave a good beating to a Hindu boy for shouting '*Bande Mataram*'! Circulars have been issued prohibiting students from being associated with national politics, and teachers proved *guilty* of national utterances or of encouraging students to attend national meetings have been visited by 'disciplinary action' or 'intervention'! Officials have invariably

asked us to be moderate in our views and utterances; their own have been conceived in an amazing spirit of power. During the Dyer Debate, Mr. Montagu said he had assumed office to carry out an alternative policy, to that of the *rule of force*; Mr. Montagu's critics in the House of Commons cried 'shame,' 'withdraw'! They, doubtless, interpreted the mind of the bureaucracy; and of all bureaucracies, perhaps, the most power-intoxicated is that of Sind. At its heart, the Sind bureaucracy believes in *government by repression*.

Will the People avoid the two dangers of *fear and violence*? Not to do it would be to betray the very Soul of the country. To fear power when we have truth on our side would be to sin against Humanity; to throw our feelings into violence would be to stab our infant Swaraj. Repression simply thrives on fear or violence. I earnestly ask as many as my voice may reach to be true, at this moment, to the message of non-violent.

It is our testing time. We can use repression in the service of Freedom if we meet it with the power of the moral ideal. Help whole-heartedly the *swadeshi* campaign, and you will have it hard that economic imperialism which is a big

block to *swaraj*. Believe in the value of suffering; and you will have the strength to sustain the Struggle to Victory.

It is worse than useless to abuse *sircar*; abuse and hate demoralise public life only a little less than fear and the *jo-hukum* attitude to officials. You forget history if you expect the bureaucracy *not* to put forth efforts to protect its interests; and you are not worthy to be a servant of the nation if you are not ready to stand the test of your professions. Therefore, I say, complain not, repression and bureaucracy go together; and repression in Sind will become more and more rigorous for some time yet. Non-co-operation is not an agitation confined to a small class of the 'educated'; it is becoming a movement of the masses; it may become a movement of revolution; 'peaceful,' 'bloodless,'—you say; but when did a bureaucracy look with favour on *any* 'revolution'? I ask Muslim friends; therefore, not to spend their strength in abusing the official class. The bureaucracy must repress, when the Muslims must non-co-operate. If non-co-operation be 'revolution,' repression is counter-revolution. Which of the two will triumph?

It is for you to decide. Your fate depends on the way you meet the challenge of bureau-

cratic repression. I ask you to meet it with *courage*. 'Heroism,' says Emerson, '*feels and never reasons, and therefore is always right.*' The man of courage does what he *feels* is right; the man who fears, *calculates*, and is therefore often weak, foolish, wrong. To *courage* add *self-control*. You must not complain; you must let the bureaucracy run its mad course of repression. Repression borne with religious idealism will do in a decade what not all political bodies put together can in half a century, it will carry the National Gospel to every home, it will convert every boy and girl to the National cause.

In this silent hour of the night India's destiny is speaking:—"Swaraj is to be and *will be.*" And thinking of the men thrown into the dungeon for the crime of patriotism, I ask:—Shall we, by fear or any the least violence, tarnish their prison-garments of Freedom? A mighty, unconquerable moment will come—is coming,—when, in thousands and tens of thousands and with love in their hearts, fill the people in the jails with truth and honor, we then shall stand in the presence of Liberty. For rule by repression cannot conquer the *moral forces* of a Nation. Has the Amritsar massacre killed

Indian nationalism? Has coercion wiped out Irish nationalism? A Divisional Commissioner in Ireland is reported to have said to police:—"The more you shoot, the better I will like you; and I assure you no policeman will get into trouble for shooting any man. We want your assistance in carrying out the scheme and wiping out Sin Fein." But Sin Fein continues to grow! And did repression succeed in Russia? There, too, they proclaimed seditious meetings acts; there, too, they imposed restrictions on the press; there, too, students were prohibited from political meetings; there, too, patriotism was tabooed as 'sedition,' there, too, people were arrested and sent to jail, thousands of them, and thousands more,—over thirty-seven thousand it is said—were sent into exile; and among those thus condemned were several boys and girls! Repression never established the credit or power of government anywhere; repression never triumphed over the moral idealism of any people.

Therefore, I ask you, my Muslim friends! to meet the challenge of repression in the right spirit. Both fear and violence are demoralising; both are marks of the weak; the bureaucracy will wander from blunder to blunder; it will

use more and more of repression to put liberty. All this and more you must expect, suffering is the frail of loyalty to the cause, and you must salute suffering with faith in the destiny of the Nation. You must not let any thought of violence enter into your words or your actions. Your strength will be in the measure in which you suffer manfully, cheerfully, for justice and right. The night is coming but not without its stars, and in all the troubles and struggles of to-day, the Ancient word abides :  
-“ Fear not ' for I thy word, am with thee ”

## THE DUTY OF RESISTANCE

It was a rich life which flowered in the Civilization of our Aryan ancestors. That Civilization was a synthetic one, with a deep reverence for knowledge and action. 'Oriental' scholars have given a distorted picture of the Aryan mind. They have told us that India found consolation in creeds, in mysticisms, in flights to the metaphysical! Did not the sages speak of *mâyâ*? And what, we are asked, did *mâyâ* mean if not a philosophy of inaction? Such 'scholars' have failed to understand the Indo-Aryan mind. They forget that ancient India studied law, politics, economics, literature, social programmes, the problems of life,—with deep human sympathy. If Panini is the world's first and foremost name in Grammar, is not Jaimini the first and foremost name in Law? Where outside the pages of Bhagavad Gita have you nobler exposition of the philosophy of Action? And who with a knowledge of Aryan history will deny that even in the pro-



Christian era India had Representative Assemblies resembling the English Parliament ?

India, as I have shown on earlier occasions, believed in Democracy—the democracy that would level *up*, not *down*. Why did India fall ? My answer to that question—and I have examined it in the light of Indian History, again and again, is.—India sundered action from thought and religion from life. A monastic ideal prevailed, and India fell. “The conquest of Sind by the Arabs,” according to a competent English writer, “was made easy by the fact that thousands of the male population had adopted the yellow robe for the sake of the easy life of the monastery.” Yes,—we fell when we sought our heaven in ease, in selfish detachment from the obligations of life.

Under a merciful Providence, we received a *shock* through our contact with the West. We *needed* a shock to bring us to our senses, to wake us up, to rouse us from inertia. The awakening is now upon the nation ; the inertia of long years is being shaken off by a painful process. I believe profoundly in the law of Karma ; and I think we should do well to blame *ourselves* for the state we are in. Shall we survive the shame and misery of sub-

jection? I believe we shall. But we must *act* in accordance with the Law. We want freedom; we do not want to be hewers of wood and drawers of water 'within the Empire'! We do not want swaraj as a 'favour' from our 'masters'. At the coming Festival of Freedom, beggars will have no place. We want to *achieve* freedom.

The power to achieve is the *power of resistance*. I believe in non-violence; and non-violence is the creed of the strong, of those who have the power to resist. Violence is weakness; *moral resistance* is strength. We have suffered so long because we have *acquiesced in*, and even *co-operated with*, a system which has inflicted upon us indignities and injustice. There is a beautiful thought developed by Bergson the French thinker. He says that *life* became *intelligence* when it had to struggle with dead matter. In throwing off the pressure upon it of matter, *life* developed into *intelligence*. May I not say we shall achieve Freedom in the measure we *resist* the dead weight of the present system? We shall throw off our subjection in the measure we *resist*.

Not with physical force! India will not enrich

Humanity by becoming a copy of Europe. The resistance I speak of involves three things : (1) *Wash your hands* of the system. Our co-operation with it gives it life. In God's name, let us wash. Let us say:—We shall have no part or lot in the Administration. (2) *Know yourselves*,—the genius, the ideals, the spirit of your Nation. With knowledge will come faith in ourselves, self-reliance, the discipline of patience, the dignity which will refuse to do violence to a single Englishman, a single stranger. (3) *Offer India the worship of sacrifice*. I believe in the ancient teaching that *sacrifice, yagna* is a *mighty force*. When that force fills the wide spaces of India's jails, we may know that the hour of our Liberation is nigh. Europe has believed in the worship of power, let it be our privilege to believe in the worship of the Ideal, the worship the Cross. I see so many still happy with many things,—*videshi* commerce and fine houses and cash-values and the fineries of a foreign civilization. And I say to myself:—“What a blasted life this, to worship the gods of the market-place when the Great God of India is marching on, calling us to the Great Yagna, the Nation-Sacrifice !”

# BOOKS by C. F. Andrews

---

## **The Claim for Independence**

Within or without the British Empire *Price As. 8.*

## **Non-co-operation**

The Whys and Wherefores. *Price As. 8.*

## **Indians in South Africa**

Helots within the British Empire. *Price As. 8.*

## **The Drink and Opium Evil**

Miss La Motte says "A nation that can subjugate 3 0,000,000 helpless Indian people, and then turn them into drug addicts, for the sake of revenue, is a nation, which commits a cold blooded atrocity unparalleled by any atrocity committed in the rage and heat of war."

*Price As. 4.*

## **How India can be Free**

"India has no need to take the sword in order to be free. She has a much more powerful weapon ready to her hand. If once her people unitedly decide to be free they can be free."

*Price As. 4.*

## **Indian Independence:**

### **The immediate need**

To be in subjection to a band of foreign rulers, if Seeley's historical maxim is true, cannot but lead to national deterioration. This is why the need for independence is so immediate. This is why it cannot be postponed. The verdict of the most sober English Historians is this, that India, without a single hand being lifted to strike a single blow, can determine her own destiny. The sheer weight of numbers,—three hundred and twenty millions against a few thousands,—is so great, that if these numbers could once speak with one mind, their will must be carried out.

*Price As. 8.*

---

**GANESH & CO. :: Publishers :: Madras**